

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AORIST AND IMPERFECT
IN SOME BALTIC AND SLAVIC LANGUAGES.

D. G. GUILD

PhD.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

1971.



Contents

Contents		i
Abbreviations		viii
Summary		1
1.0	Introduction	4
1.1	Aspectual nature of the aor : imp opposition.	
1.12 - 1.14	Origin of the concept of tense opposition found in IE.	
1.20 - 1.21	Slavic languages borrow elements of IE system (s-aor); develop own system of oppositions.	
1.30	The Baltic past tense system.	
1.31 - 1.32	The Baltic preterite.	
1.33 - 1.35	The imperfect forms in Baltic.	
1.40	The category of aspect in Baltic and Slavic.	
1.41	Baltic and Slavic systems differ from IE system.	
1.42 - 1.422	The hierarchy of Aspect and Aktionsart.	
1.50 - 1.52	Typological features found in Baltic and Slavic.	
1.60 - 1.64	Comparison of La and L vb system.	
2.0	<u>The aspectual distribution of the preterite in Lithuanian.</u>	20
2.1	Diverges from the Slavic pattern.	
2.11	Lithuanian usage established over several centuries; bi-aspectual vbs as in Slavic; vbs of perception.	

- 2.12 Statal verbs.
- 2.13 Other bi-aspectual vbs.
- 2.131 - 2.1311 Vbs of saying.
- 2.1312 Phasal vbs.
- 2.132 P alternants of bi-aspectual vbs.
- 2.20 - 2.222 Formal criteria used in differentiating the
p aspect in Lithuanian.
- 2.223 Imperfectivising prefixes in Slavic.
- 2.2231 The distribution of imperfective markers in
Bulgarian and Macedonian.
- 2.30 Imperfectivising suffixes in Lithuanian.
- 2.31 Iterative forms in Lithuanian.
- 2.32 The formants -ioti and -inėti.
- 2.40 Attempts to systematise verbal aspect in
Lithuanian.
- 2.41 - 2.432 A proposed systematisation by L Dambriūnas.
- 2.44 Imperfectivisation: the suffix -inėti.
- 2.45 The prefix be-.
- 2.451 - 2.453 The prefix be-: a marker of duration.
- 2.50 Analysis of neutral verbs in the preterite.
- 2.51 - 2.54 Distribution of neutral verbs.
- 2.60 The point action vbs.
- 2.61 - 2.64 The distribution of point action vbs.
- 2.70 The suffix -telėti.
- 2.71 - 2.722 Interaction of vbs in -telėti and prefixed
p vbs from the same root.
- 2.723 L -telėti and Slavic -neti.
- 2.80 Imperfectivising suffixes.

- 2.81 -inēti with i vbs.
- 2.820 The suffix -inēti with p vbs.
- 2.821 - 2.822 Distribution of -inēti with prefixed vbs.
- 2.90 - 2.94 The Lithuanian aspect: Summary.
-
- 3.0 Aspect in Latvian
- 3.1 Similarities with the L system.
- 3.120 The creation of p forms from i forms.
- 3.121 Prefixation.
- 3.122 - 3.123 Preference shown for certain prefixes.
- 3.20 Polysemy of p aspect prefixes.
- 3.21 Existence of more than one p form to certain i forms.
- 3.220 Prefixed form retains the basic meaning.
- 3.221 Primary role of prefix.
- 3.222 - 3.223 Iterative suffixes in Latvian.
- 3.224 Latvian preference for analytical constructions.
- 3.30 The Analytical Construction.
- 3.31 Adverbs alternating with prefixes as markers of aspect.
- 3.320 - 3.322 An analysis of the markers of the analytical construction.
- 3.330 - 3.341 Restrictions and anomalies in the use of analytical construction.
- 3.350 - 3.353 Origins of the analytical construction; emphatic usage.
- 3.40 - 3.426 A comparison of the Lith and La aspectual system.
- 3.50 - 3.53 The concept of aspect in Baltic.

- 4.0 The aor and the imp tense.
- 4.10 Definition.
- 4.11 Distributional factors marking aor and imp;
relationship of both to present..
- 4.12 Aor and imp now restricted in area.
- 4.13 Factors leading to the disappearance of simple
past tenses: competition of perfect.
- 4.20 Interaction of tense and aspect in Bulgarian
and Macedonian.
- 4.21 - 4.215 Bulgarian.
- 4.30 - 4.32 Macedonian.
- 4.4 Summary.
- 4.41 Use of aorist as narrative form.
- 4.42 - 4.43 Reduction in distinctiveness; closer association
of tense and aspect.
- 4.44 Comparison to be made with Baltic; restriction
to Bulgarian, Lithuanian and Latvian.
- 5.0 Comparison of the simple past tense forms of
Bulgarian, Lithuanian and Latvian.
- 5.1 B and M tenses fully developed in CCS
- 5.2 Lith past tenses.
- 5.21 The frequentative past.
- 5.3 The simple past tenses in Latvian.
- 5.31 Absence of fp of L type in Latvian.
- 5.32 The La frequentative past form.
- 5.321 The vb mēgt.
- 5.322 Regularity in distribution.
- 5.33 Intermediate position of Lithuanian between
Bulgarian and Latvian

- 5.34 L fp : pret - B imp : aor.
- 5.341 - 5.342 Frequency and regularity of L fp.
- 5.40 - 5.4211 Lack of consistency shown by La usage.
- 5.430 - 5.432 Emphatic nature of mēgt. Quantitative comparison stresses the emphatic nature of the La construction.
- 5.433 Grammaticalisation of L fp; La construction lacks grammatical status.
- 5.434 Relationship of mēgt to aspect system.
- 5.50 A comparison of past tense usage in Lithuanian, and Bulgarian.
- 5.51 Range of meaning of L fp more restricted. interaction of aspect and tense in Baltic and Bulgarian.
- 5.52 - 5.55 Processional, durative and generalised usage of B imperfect expressed aspectually in Baltic.
- 5.551 The suppletive role of aspect in Baltic.
- 5.552 - 5.553 B relationship of aor: aspect paralleled in Baltic; use of perfect as suppletive for preterite in Baltic.
- 5.60 - 5.63 Relationship of aor: pret; part played by perfect; aspect determined by context in Baltic.
- 5.631 - 5.632 Neutralisation of formal markers of perfectivisation by Baltic in certain classes of vbs.
- 5.633 - 5.635 Retention of emphatic nuances in perfectivising prefixes.
- 5.636 - 5.637 Contrast between grammatical status of certain prefixes and specialised emphatic prefixes.

- 5.638 B aor - Baltic pret/perfect.
- 5.70 The imperfective aor in Bulgarian.
- 5.71 - 5.715 Functional role of i aor equivalent to i pret:
neutralisation of asp : tense opposition in
Baltic bi-aspectual vbs.
- 5.72 Effects of B innovating system.
- 5.722 - 5.723 Agreement between Baltic and Bulgarian most
frequent in certain contexts.
- 5.8 - 5.82 Restricted range of meaning of Baltic fp forms
influences tense oppositions.
- 5.9 Analysis on various levels; question of influence.
- 6.0 Conclusions
- 6.1 Tendencies in the direction of polarisation.
- 6.20 The formal criteria marking aspect.
- 6.21 - 6.211 The role of prefixes.
- 6.212 Specialised suffixes.
- 6.213 Simple p vbs.
- 6.22 A large class of bi-aspectual vbs.
- 6.30 - 6.322 Marking the imperfective.
- 6.330 - 6.332 Restrictions on use of imperfectivising formants;
extensive role of Aktionsarten and bi-aspectual
vbs.
- 6.333 "Hyperimperfectives".
- 6.334 Specialised imperfectives.
- 6.335 - 6.34 Intermediate stage of Baltic with reference
to Slavic.
- 6.40 - 6.421 The problem of influence.

- 6.43 The three stages in the development of the Baltic aspect system.
- 6.50 The tense opposition in Baltic.
- 6.51 Latvian usage more typical of Common Baltic.
- 6.53 The fp an independent development of Lith; emphatic nature of Latvian construction.
- 6.54 Semantic range of Baltic frequentative forms more restricted than B imperfect.
- 6.55 Baltic fp forms and B imp excluded from narrative sequence.
- 6.56 Development of tense oppositions shows the same characteristics as the aspect system.
- 6.561 - 6.62 Baltic literary languages a recent creation.
- 6.621 Retention of s-future in Baltic - Slavic area resemble each other; a typological resemblance.
- 6.624 The L fp the result of "Stimulus Diffusion"?
- 6.625 The L fp a Baltic creation.
- 6.626 Results of phonological changes in Latvian on the development of tense and aspect.
- 6.27 Tense opposition - a creation of Lithuanian.
- 6.70 - 6.75 Final remarks.

Appendices

186

Bibliography

225

Abbreviationsa) Languages

Bulgarian: B
 Common Slavic: CS
 English: Eng, E.
 French: Fr
 German: Ger
 Germanic: Germ, Gmc
 Greek: Gk
 Indo-European: IE
 Latin: Lat
 Latvian: La
 Lithuanian: L, Lith
 Macedonian: M
 Old Church Slavic: OCS
 Polish: Pol
 Proto-Indo-European: PIE
 Russian: R
 Sanscrit: Skt
 Ukrainian: Ukr
 White Russian: WR

b) Grammatical terms,

Adjective: adj
 adverb: adv

ancient: anc
 aorist: aor
 feminine: fem, f
 frequentative past: fp
 imperfect: imp
 imperfective: i
 Instrumenta: instr
 Intensive: intens
 Intransitive: intr
 Iterative: iter
 dual: du (insert between aor and fem)
 Masculine: masc, m
 perfective: p
 person: P
 plural: pl
 present: pres
 singular: sg
 verb: vb

c) Questionnaire = Q

sentence = s.

Questionnaire No 15 = Q15

Informants are indicated by the letter of the language concerned
 followed by a number, i.e. B 1. = Bulgarian one.

SUMMARY

Chapter 1.

In this chapter are discussed the factors which led us to make a typological study of the languages in question (Lithuanian, Latvian and Bulgarian). The two surviving Baltic languages show sufficient common features with Bulgarian to make such a study worthwhile and yet, since they are at no point contiguous geographically, such similarities are likely to be the result of separate development. Since one can exclude the possibility of direct influence it became necessary to discuss what Baltic and Slavic had inherited from IE.

Both language groups inherited certain grammatical features from IE, but not in every case the same features. Baltic, for instance, inherited the future in -s-, while Slavic inherited the sigmatic aorist (also found in Skt and Anc. Gk.). Despite these initial differences the two language groups have converged at least in respect of certain of their members. Thus while Bulgarian inherited the imperfect: aorist opposition from OCS Lithuanian has subsequently created an opposition of this type.

Chapter 2.

This chapter discusses the aspect system in modern Lithuanian. This system shows many similarities with the Slavic system in general. It is characterised, however, by a series of limitations not present to nearly the same extent in Slavic. We have concentrated here on past usage.

Chapter 3.

The Latvian aspect system diverges somewhat from both Slavic

and Lithuanian. It is proposed tentatively here that these differences arose from the internal phonological development of the language. These phonological changes have brought in their train morphological changes which precluded the adoption of the means used to differentiate aspect found in both Lithuanian and Slavic. The Latvian response to the problem of differentiating aspect has been different. It is suggested that the Latvian system is of fairly recent development.

Chapter 4.

A discussion follows of the tense oppositions still to be found in SS1 (in this instance Bulgarian and Macedonian). These oppositions though closely linked to aspect show certain distinctive features which are not present in the aspectual opposition (perfective : imperfective). Nevertheless there is a tendency to polarise tense and aspect, i.e. to associate imperfect tense and imperfective aspect and aor and perfective aspect.

Chapter 5.

Here we investigated the development of a temporal opposition in Baltic. Since such an opposition already existed in Slavic, Bulgarian usage has been taken as the norm. Baltic usage has been compared with that of Bulgarian where this was possible.

Chapter 6.

Conclusion.

Despite their very extensive normalisation of the inherited verbal system (particularly with reference to the trans : intr opposition)

in the matter of aspect the Baltic languages show an incomplete realisation of the opposition imperfective : perfective. Both Lithuanian and Latvian innovate, Lithuanian in the direction of Slavic, since it uses suffixal morphemes to differentiate the imperfective from the perfective. Latvian uses semi-free morphemes (in origin adverbs of place and manner) to replace the prefixes of the compound p verb.

In the matter of tense Lithuanian shows a greater capacity for innovation in creating the opposition between the freq past and the preterite. This opposition recalls the Slavic opposition of imp : aor, though it is restricted in its range of meaning. Latvian shows a potential for forming such an opposition though its relative infrequency precludes the formation of an effective opposition.

In general the Baltic languages show a lower degree of grammaticalisation in the temporal and aspectual oppositions. This factor is accompanied as one might expect by a heightened capacity for realising the Aktionsarten. In fact one cannot exclude the factor of expressiveness; this factor is even more important than completeness when it is a matter of selecting the appropriate aspect. For that matter the selection of the appropriate simple past tense also depends on the expressive nature of the context. The Lith forms in -davo and the Latvian construction with mēdza are more emphatic than the Bulgarian imperfect, though for this very reason their range of meaning is more restricted.

1.0. Introduction

1.1. The aim of the present study is to show how a distinction which is essentially aspectual in nature has developed temporal formal oppositions and how these are distributed within the aspectual category. In two of the languages chosen the features included under the terms aorist and imperfect are inherited features from an earlier stage of the language and indeed, it appears, from IE. In Lithuanian an imperfect:aorist contrast has arisen in recent historical times, and, while this imperfect is a feature of the standard literary language it is in origin dialectal (Aukštaičiai) and not to be found in the closely related Latvian, where with a low frequency other means have been used to make this contrast.

1.12. The aspectual nature of the opposition is of considerable antiquity and this is confirmed by the formal distinctions: it is to be observed in Anc. Gk. where in the oldest verbal strata a system of three roots can be detected in certain verbs: in terms of this system, while the perfective was marked by contrast with the imperfective, there also existed a third term, the aorist, which in certain contexts could be in opposition with both imperfective and perfective. (cf. JL., 314-315).

1.13. The Greek imperfect tense was formed from the same base as the present tense, since the feature of duration was present in both these tenses but absent from the aorist, which was formed from another base. The concept of anteriority is shown by other features: the present tense uses the primary set of endings (-mi, -si, -t).

Sanskrit too shows an imperfect tense formed on the present base while the aorist has a separate base. The augment too, if one is to judge by formal criteria, appears to have had a temporal significance. The imperfect possesses a different set of endings from the present (the secondary endings) but the feature of pastness which differentiates it from the present is further reinforced by the presence of the augment: of sunomi - I press out: asunavam (imp) - I pressed out. The aorist shares this augment with the imperfect. The characteristic of the perfect on the other hand is reduplication: tan - stretch, has a perfect tatana (tātana). Sanskrit does not use the pluperfect but in Anc. Greek this tense, though not in frequent use, is differentiated from the perfect by the use of an augment, thus further stressing the concept of anteriority.

1.14. The aorist as has been mentioned, contrasts thematically with the durative tenses. This distinction became eroded with time and in any case was not characteristic of every verb, and a special suffix was developed to keep this distinction clear, namely the morpheme -s-, giving rise to the term "sigmatic" as applied to this tense. Sigmatic aorists were highly developed in Gk. and Skt. Vestiges of this formant are to be found in some Latin perfects, e.g. dixi. In that language, however, the aspectual distinction has become blurred in favour of the concept of tense. The Romance descendants of Latin have re-created this aspectual distinction in both writing and speech where a past definite (<Lat perfect) contrasts with the perfect (compound past).^{1.}

1. Italian, Spanish and Portuguese do use the past definite in speech whereas in French it is confined to the written language.

1.20. The earliest written records of Slavic show a similar aspectual opposition between an aorist and an imperfect. There are certain notable differences when compared with the systems of Greek and Sanskrit. The causes for this appear to be the loss of certain formal distinctions: firstly the augment, which was one of the signs conveying anteriority, disappeared (or had never been present). At a certain stage in the pre-history of OCS the formal aspectual distinction between imperfect and aorist was lost. The position of the so-called root aorists became unstable. Certain persons of their paradigm were indistinguishable from that of the present tense: *idete* 2P aor or 2P pres. The spread of parallel forms with a sigmatic aorist resolved this source of confusion. For a time both forms are to be met in texts. Already extant was a sigmatic form for the imperfect whose characteristic marker was *-ax* or *-ĕax*. The origin of this suffix is obscure, though it may reflect a form of the vb to be *-ēs-*. The distribution of the variants was: *-ax-* to vowel stems and *-ĕax-* to consonant stems; cf. *bĭra-ax-*: *nesĕ-ax-*.

Whatever its origin the suffix suffered the attraction of the not dissimilar aor paradigm. Within the imp paradigm we find variants which have been borrowed from the latter. Besides the correct *nesĕaĕeta* we find *nesĕasta*.

1.21. The long endings of this tense, like the long endings of the definite adjective, suffered contraction in later texts: *-a-ax-* was reduced to *-ax*, and *-ĕ-ax* to *-ĕx*. In the modern languages

which still possess aor and imp tenses the formal distinction between them has been eliminated in certain classes of verbs with the exception of the 2/3P sg. (HGL, 23.1, note 1). The levelling in the vowel of the suffix has been accompanied by levelling in the morphemes distinguishing person, and this was already taking place in the OCS period. In modern Bulgarian and Macedonian as stated above there remains in effect only one personal morpheme which can be assigned unambiguously to one of the tenses and not to the other, namely the suffix *-še*. This suffix is unambiguously imperfect. The 3P suffix *-ha* could be assigned to either aor or imp. In contexts where aorist alternates with historic present doubt could again arise, but only in the 3P sg. In the 2P sg only the aorist could have this suffix. Other environmental factors can be invoked to clear up the occasional confusing instances.

1.30. The most highly developed verbal system in the Baltic group is the Lithuanian. Again we see an opposition between two simple past tenses. The Baltic nomenclature is different: the tense that would formally be identified with the aorist is the preterite; though the distributional pattern is somewhat different the usage shows sufficient similarity for one to make comparisons between the two language groups; the Slavic imperfect is to be equated with the Lithuanian frequentative past.

1.31. The marker of the preterite in Baltic is the morphemic alternation *-ā/-ē-*. The modern reflexes of this morphemic alternation are in Lithuanian *-o/-e*, which can be derived historically from the two long vowels. In Latvian contraction has taken place in

final position in both verbal and nominal suffixes to a much greater extent than in Lithuanian. Thus in the paradigm of the long (definite) adjective L *mažąja* and *mažąjį* have both become *mazo*; the *-a-* marker of the preterite has become *-a*, though *-ā-* is found in the reflexive form of the preterite: *nēmąs*; *pēmās* (took). The cause of this is undoubtedly a shift of the stress on to the first syllable at some time in the pre-literate period. 2.

Long vowels do occur in final position in open syllables but they are the reflexes of original diphthongs rather than simple vowels. 3. The marker of the preterite in Latvian is *-a/-ja*, with the latter appearing after front vowel; the variant *-e* is no longer found in the standard literary language though it does occur in the *dainas* (folksongs), collected for the most part at the end of the XVIII century. Nevertheless for the reasons stated above it is possible to postulate *-ā/-ē-* as common Baltic, or at least common East Baltic since there is not enough evidence to come to any firm conclusions on the verbal structure of Old Prussian.

1.32. The distribution in Lithuanian of *-o/-e* is determined partly on phonetic grounds and partly on lexical class and need not concern us here. The suffix *-e* can only be assigned to the

2. There seems little doubt that the shift of stress is due to the influence of a Finnic substratum.

3. The marker of the locative *-ā* can be derived from a form *-āje*, cf. L *-oje*. By analogical extension masc o-stems also have *-ā* (L *-e*); sim. L *-yje*, *-uje* and *eje* correspond to La *-ī*, *-ū* and *-ē*.

past tense while -o is found in the present (of vbs with the infin in -yti and -oti). Similarly in Latvian -a is also a present tense formant. No ambiguity arises, however, within the verb itself. For instance Lithuanian sakyti has 3P pres sako; the past is however, saké. Similarly žinoti has 3P pres žino and the 3P past žinojo. Attention should be drawn here to the fact that the Baltic vb only distinguishes number in the first and second persons.

1.33. As stated above (1.1.) only Lithuanian clearly distinguishes the imperfect category. Latvian can make this distinction by use of the auxiliary verb mēgt (of. KM, II., mēgt - gewohnt sein) followed by an infinitive, i.e. es mēdzu iet (I used to go). Some informants claim that this usage is disappearing, though examples do occur in recent Latvian literature. In Lithuanian the category is still very productive and the contrast between this form and the preterite is clearly marked.

1.34. The Lithuanian Imperfect (Frequentative Past).

This tense is very clearly marked by the suffix -davo which is attached to the same base as the infinitive: i.e. neš-davo - he used to carry, saky-davo - he used to say. A synchronic analysis of this suffix would reduce it to two bound morphemes: -dav- and -o where -dav is the iterative intensive element and -o one of the possible alternants of the past (-o/-é). A diachronic analysis on the other hand finds three bound morphemes; -d- -au- -ā. If we work from the end the -ā is again the marker of the past tense; -au- is in origin a derivational suffix with an iterative-intensive meaning and it is still productive in verbal derivation. These verbs with

the suffix -au- before the infinitive replace -u- by -v- before the past suffix. The initial -d- had no referential significance, for its purpose is merely to prevent hiatus when the vb stem ends in a vowel or a diphthong, and this is still its function (cf. papildyti (fill up), where -il is diphthong). The -d- in -davo no longer serves this purpose and it would seem reasonable to accept Christian Stang's explanation for this phenomenon (ChSt, pp 172-173). In Stang's view the suffix -davo was originally found with vbs whose stem ended in a vowel, for instance ei-davo < ei-ti (to go). Later it was attached to all vbs as a pure suffix, without any change by analogical extension.

1.35. Although it is a feature of the standard literary language it is, as we have remarked, (1.1.) in origin a dialectal feature of Aukštaičiai. It is found only in the Aukštaičiai area, where two other variants occur, -lavo where -l- appears to fulfil the same function as -d- in the standard variant, and a combination of the two -dlavo.

1.36. It is evident from the above that this tense is the result of internal development within the Lithuanian language area. There does not appear to be any stimulus from outside, In fact in White Russian and Polish the inherited aorist and imperfect had for the most part disappeared before the first Lithuanian written records appeared before the end of the XVI century. Conversely this Lithuanian form has not spread beyond the borders of Lithuania, nor has it influenced Latvian.

1.40. The Category of Aspect in Baltic and Slavic.

1.41. The presence of aspect in Baltic and Slavic is well attested and the existence of an earlier aspectual system in PIE as exemplified by Anc. Greek usage would in all likelihood have acted as a stimulus to the formation of the Baltic and Slavic systems. The Baltic and Slavic systems closely resemble each other though they differ from that of Gk in that they are essentially oppositions of two different verbal paradigms of one verb.

1.42. The aspectual systems of Baltic and Slavic are hierarchic: in addition to the higher category of aspect there are sub-categories which are usually referred to as Aktionsarten. These can be very numerous depending on the level of analysis and they can be assigned places within the higher category. If one posits limitation of an action as one of the basic concepts embodied in the notion of perfectivity, then vbs connoting the beginning of an action could be assigned to the perfective aspect. A verbal action can be conceived as a line to which the beginning and the end stand as fixed points, as boundaries. Both of these fixed points may be considered as ends or limits, and as limits they are in opposition to action looked upon as a continuum. To the perfective aspect too could be assigned verbs connoting a single action (semelfactive). The imperfective aspect is not concerned with limitation; here it is a question of duration. The action is a continuum and a vb in this aspect will be neutral as to limitation. It is the action that is important and not the limits one may set to it. Thus verbs which connote frequent action are imperfective; intensification of an action

(smash, shatter, beat) is also an imperfective category. There can be no doubt, however, that Aktionsarten are sub-categories and are hierarchically on a lower level than the two main categories; perfective and imperfective.

1.421. The part played by the Aktionsarten in the development of the aspectual system has nevertheless been considerable. It would seem likely therefore that the elements differentiating the Aktionsarten were in existence before the full development of a two-aspect system which was later to make use of these same elements. The inherited feature in Baltic and Slavic would consist of the following: root and thematic morphemes which distinguished the two tense systems, 'aorist' and 'present', and a less systematic group of morphemes which characterised the various Aktionsarten.

1.422. In the Slavic group as we have seen (1.20) the distinction inherent in the PIE aorist and imperfect tenses was lost and this may have prompted the development of an aspect system making use of the elements which characterised the Aktionsarten. The development of aspectual distinctions in the Slavic group can be analysed as follows: firstly the simple verb (i.e. non-prefixed) was prefixed: this limited the action of the simple and in time created an aspectual opposition to the simple verb. One can compare the simple verb 'pisat' (R., to write) with its perfective counterpart 'napisat'. No change in the meaning of the verb has taken place, it still means to write, though the attitude of the speaker to the verbal action has changed in that he now looks on the act of writing as finished. In the modern language such prefixes can be characterised as 'empty'

in that they do not transfer the verb to a different lexical set.

If we were to add the prefix pod- to this verb the verb again

becomes perfective though here a semantic change has taken place;

the verb podpisat' is no longer to write but to sign. Had the

system remained static a lack of balance would have existed within

each lexical set; for some lexemes there would have been a pair of

verbs (one prefixed and one simple) napisat': pisat' contrasting

aspect though not meaning, others again would have had only one

member (the perfective prefixed member). The response to this

problem could be set out as follows: Simplex bëreti¹ - prefixed

sübëreti² 2=both limit (goal) achieved and limit aimed at.

To resolve this ambiguity, suffixed forms are created on analogy

of (vy-)nesti: (vy-)nositi to give sübira-jeti³; 3 now - goal

(limit) aimed at and is imperfective; 2 continues to equal limit

achieved or arrived at and finally resolves into limit achieved only.

This process was carried throughout the whole verbal system, thus

creating the resultant polarisation into two aspects which has been

regarded as one of the most characteristic features of the Slavic

verb.

1.50. In a comparative study of this nature one must ask oneself

to what extent the same system (i.e. the Slavic system) can be said

to be true of the Baltic languages since these languages can also

be shown to possess aspect. It would be perfectly possible to

compare Lithuanian and Polish but since no past tense differentiation

exists in either Russian or Polish the comparison would only give

imperfect results. Bulgarian and Macedonian on the other hand do

possess this contrast and in addition there are other typological

features which are sufficiently alike for such a comparison to give adequate results. No attempt is being made here to suggest that there existed at one stage a genetic link between Baltic and Slavic and that these languages on the periphery of the Balto-Slavic language area are too distant to have influenced each other. One of the more striking typological features shared by these four languages to a greater or lesser degree is the existence of a group of verb forms which serve to indicate that an utterance may refer to a hypothetical action, or one for which the speaker cannot vouch personally. (In Lithuanian such verb forms are not so fully developed as in the other three languages since these forms are used to indicate indirect speech and not for hypothetical contexts).

Here again is one case where no genetic link can be proved. In fact the presence of the so-called renarrative tenses in Bulgarian and Macedonian can be directly traced to the influence of the Turkish superstratum during the long period of Ottoman domination of the Balkan peninsula. In modern Turkish these renarrative tenses correspond to forms in *-miş* (where *-miş* stands for any one of four possible variants *-miş*, *-mîş*, *-muş*, *müş*) which render a similar concept: cf. *Profesör yarın gelecekmîş* - The professor is supposed to be coming tomorrow. or, *Trenle gelmişsiniz* - (I gather) You came by train.

Since there has been no direct or indirect influence between the Balkans and the Baltic, the Baltic 'relative mood' can only be considered as an independent development.

1.51. The Bulgarian and Macedonian renarrative tenses make use of compound forms to represent this compound formally. In origin

these forms are based on the 1-tenses, i.e. those participles in -l which have been used throughout the Slavic area to form the perfect and the pluperfect. Theoretically the 1-participle used in the formation of the perfect, pluperfect and future perfect is based on the aorist stem (or the infinitive stem when the language in question does not possess an aorist), while the 1-participle used in forming renarrative tenses is based on the imperfect stem. Thus Bulgarian 'Az sēm, pisal' is formally similar to the R 'Ja pisal' or P (Ja) pisalēm'. Opposed to Az sēm pisal we have the renarrative form 'Pišel sēm. Though these renarrative forms exist for every verb, some verbs have only one form for both the aorist and imperfect 1-participle. This is even more true of Macedonian than of Bulgarian.

1.52. In Baltic too participial verb forms are employed to render this concept. A Lithuanian example occurs in Dr. Petras Jonikas (Lietuvių Kalbos Istorija, p 38). Speaking about the Kurs (a tribe speaking a dialect closely related to Latvian) he refers to the comments of a mediaeval traveller, G. de Lannoy: '1413 m. keliauninkas G. de Lannoy sako, kad Kuršiai turi savo atskirą kalbą' (In 1413 the traveller G. de Lannoy said (says) that the Kurs have their own separate language.) Here Jonikas uses the present participle turi (nom pl m) instead of the expected finite form. Latvian in this context makes frequent use of indeclinable forms in -ot (cf. esot) to render the relative mood, to use the Baltic term for this phenomenon. In fairy tales and legends, however, one also finds the past participle in -is (-us-).

1.60. Compared with Lithuanian the verbal system of Latvian is

simpler. While the process of normalisation on the basis of the more regular thematic paradigm has been carried out to a very great extent in Baltic, the phonetic changes which took place in Latvian (in the XIV century for the most part) have resulted in a loss of certain contrasts which are still present in Lithuanian. In this period there took place a palatalisation of velars strongly reminiscent of the Slavic Second Palatalisation; i.e. $k > c$ and $g > dz$. The third element of the Slavic palatalisation $x > s/\zeta$ is not represented since the spirant /x/ has never been present in Baltic outside German or Slavic loan words. A new series of morphophonemic alternations was set up, as for instance in *tu roc* (you dig) *viņš rok* (he/they etc., dig(s)). Nasal vowels became oral vowels or diphthongs⁴ and these changes altered the verbal paradigm. In some instances minimal pairs were set up differing only in this feature: the verb *krist* (to fall) contrasts present *kri̯tu* (I fall): pret *kritu* (I fell). In Lithuanian the same forms appear as *krintu*: *kri̯tau* where the past: present contrast is marked both by the nasal infix (in the present) and by the opposition -u: au in the first person suffix. The conditional in Lithuanian has a full paradigm in three numbers (Lithuanian has preserved the dual). In Latvian on the other hand the paradigm has been reduced to one form -tu which is used for all persons, thus necessitating the constant presence of the personal

4. Lithuanian: Latvian correspondences:

L/an/ : La/uo/ (written o)

L/en/ : La/ie/

L/in/ : La/i/

L/un/ : La/ū/

pronouns.

1.61. The presence of aspect is marked in Latvian as in Lithuanian. One can set up the following set of contrasts using an 'empty' prefix: L *éjo*: La *gāja*: R *šēl/hodil* - imperfective: L *paéjo*: La *pagāja*: R *pošēl*. Here the aspect is clearly distinguished and in each case we have a pair of verbs contrasted for aspect but exhibiting no other contrastive features.

1.62. Formally the distribution within the Baltic languages of aspectually contrasted forms is not so simple as would appear from the above example; for in Petras Cvirka's novel Zemé Maitintoja (p. 67) we have a sentence with the perfective verb *atvykti*: 'Po pietų jie atvyko į Kauną.' (After dinner they arrived in Kaunas). In this context the perfective is correct and this sentence type would fit just as well into a Slavic pattern. There appears, however, to be no corresponding imperfective form for this verb, and this is by no means an isolated case. The going verbs can take most of the verbal prefixes; beside the basic opposition *eiti*: *paėiti* we find the following: *ateiti* (come); *išeiti* (go out); *nueiti* (go away); *praėiti* (pass, cross), and so on. Of these it is only the simple verb *eiti* which has a corresponding p form *paėiti* (or one might say that only *paėiti* has a corresponding i form: *eiti*). At first glance all the others appear to be only perfective. In a dictionary one will find the R vb 'pribyvat' glossed not only by p *atvykti* but also by *ateidinėti*, which is imperfective. Is the existence of such a form sufficient reason for one to set up a system of aspectual pairs such as one finds in all Slavic languages?

1.63. Before going on to discuss this feature in greater detail one must also mention briefly at this stage a certain type of imperfective opposition which is to be found in Latvian. In this language as in Lithuanian prefixation is a means of creating perfective verbs. If one takes the simple verb iet and prefixes pa- one obtains the corresponding perfective palet; one may change the meaning of the verb by using other prefixes and at the same time creating a new series of perfective vbs which correspond aspectually to palet and not to iet. These closely resemble the L equivalents as can be seen from the following examples: La noiet - L nueiti (go away); La iziet - L išeiti (go out), etc. According to TYL, p.180, analytical forms corresponding to the prefixed vbs exist. If one takes as one's starting point the simple vb nest (carry), which is imperfective, and adds to this form the prefix ie- (in) one obtains ienest (carry in) which is perfective; 'I carried in' would thus normally be 'es ienesu'. Corresponding to this form there exists an analytical form es nesu iekšā which is identical in meaning but contrasts aspectually with 'es ienesu'!

Many other examples of this type of construction can be cited: e.g. pieliet: fill up p es pieleju; es leju pilnu; uzcelties: get up; p es uzceļos; i es ceļos aukšā; ieiet: go in; p es ieeju; es eju iekšā.

(The above examples are all present tense)

Structurally the separable elements iekšā, pilnu, augšā etc., are free forms of adverbial origin; elsewhere they are used as adverbs of place and manner. An illustration of this usage where no aspectual contrast is being made is as follows: Jānis iegāja mājā; iekšā bija viņa brālis - John went into the house; his

brother was inside. For analytical forms of this type to constitute the basis of an aspectual polarity within the verbal paradigm it would have to be established that potentially any prefixed verb could have such an analytical form, and secondly that this process could be applied to any member of the verbal paradigm; for instance one does find *gāja iekšā*; is it also possible to find examples of *veda iekšā*?

1.64. The Baltic languages possess iterative forms and Lithuanian is particularly well equipped in this respect. In Latvian we find *vadāt* beside *vest* (lead) *nesāt*: *nest* (carry). In Lithuanian there are easily recognisable cognates - *vesti*: *vedžioti* and *nešti*: *nešioti*. Here again we have a potential source of imperfectivisation, though the above forms do not by any means exhaust the suffixes available for this purpose. In the next chapter we shall consider in greater detail the distribution of aspectual contrasts within the Lithuanian verb, but concentrating on the preterite.

2.0. The aspectual distribution of the Preterite in Lithuanian.

2.1. An analysis of the aspectual distribution of the Lithuanian past tense (preterite) shows certain divergences from the Slavic pattern in respect of the formal criteria: thus a prefixed vb may occur in a context where following Slavic usage one would normally expect an imperfective. In such contexts the Lithuanian verb is formally perfective. One is obliged therefore to consider whether the formal criteria (i.e. suffixes, prefixes etc.,) are a reliable means of assigning vbs to this category or whether one should lay greater stress on the contextual criteria.

2.11. In considering distributional criteria no noticeable difference can be seen in material collected from Leskien⁵, or in the literature of the present day. For instance in Juozas Baltušis, 'Paskutinis tylus džiaugsmas' we find an imperfective use of the verb skaityti (read):

'Būdinga medicinos darbuotojams aistra skaitė grožinę literatūrą ir apie viską turėjo savo nuomonę. (She read with a passion characteristic of a medical worker artistic literature (belles-lettres) and had her own opinion about everything). (Ptd p. 41). The Russian translation while differing slightly in the choice of the verb (R *uvlekalas*) agrees in using the imperfective aspect. This is perfectly reasonable, since the author is concerned with the manner in which she read literature and not in the finishing of a particular act of reading. In an example from Leskien (ALLL p7)

5. A. Leskien, Litauisches Lesebuch, Heidelberg, 1919.

we find the perfective form of the same verb: 'jis aukštyn pažiūrėjo ir pamatė ir ji paskaitė (he looked up and saw the writing and read it). Here there are a series of actions 'looking up', 'seeing' and 'reading' all completed, and as one might expect one finds a series of perfective vbs. In each case the same prefix is used pa- corr. to SL po-; used as an aspect marker it frequently acquires a purely formal meaning, that of perfectivity. Even as an aspect marker it may contain the additional nuance that the action of the verb in question is of short duration. We thus have a series of aspectual pairs: skaitė: paskaitė; žiūrėjo: pažiūrėjo and matė: pamatė. It is worth noting in passing that the verbs žiūrėti and matyti occur more frequently in the imperfective form than in the perfective. Again in Leskien we have ... 'ką tu čia matei? (what did you see here?) and 'Aš čia mačiau baisią, bedugnį degantį, (I saw a fearsome burning place,....) (ALLL, p. 5.) In both instances we are interested in what he saw, i.e. the object of the 'seeing' and not in the result of the act of seeing. Further consideration leads one to suspect that we are concerned with a verb whose normal forms will be imperfective and that perfectivisation will imply a special type of action. One can compare this usage with that of verbs of perception in Russian. 'Videt' is far commoner than 'uvidet' and 'to see' is in effect a bi-aspectual verb; the form 'uvidet' corresponds to 'to see for a moment or to catch sight of'. An example of the latter usage of matyti can also be found in Leskien: 'Čia taip bekalbėdami jie tolyn ėjo ir pamatė butelį. (And speaking thus they carried on their way and caught sight of the house, ALLL., p. 4). The Lithuanian sentence can be rendered into Russian: Govorja tak, oni šli dal'se i uvidel domik. Both the Russian uvidel and the L pamatė have the

meaning of caught sight of where the verbal meaning contains both the notions of 'suddenness' and 'momentariness'. In contrast the verbs éjo and šli are unmarked since they connote an action which is in progress when the house was seen for the first time. A perfective usage of girdėti (to hear) further exemplifies this type of verbal action: 'Tuos žodžius unterapiciers bebėgdams gerai išgirdio ir įsitęmyjo (While running the NCO heard those words clearly and took careful note of them, ALLL., p 5). Of the aspectual pair girdėti: išgirsti, the perfective išgirsti is the less common. Many other instances of this type of opposition can be found: cf. Petras Cvirka: 'Ir tikrai Monika pamatė iš tolo miestą,. (And indeed Monika saw the city from afar. PCZM, - 68) Again the subject was given only a glimpse initially of the object she was looking for.

2.12. Statal verbs are another lexical class where perfectivisation is not commonly found. Examples of these verbs are very frequent, particularly of gulėti (to lie) and sėdėti (to sit); cf. in Petras Cvirka: '... Monika sėdėjo prie surištos, pusiau nukirptos avies ... (Monica was sitting by the tethered, half-clipped sheep..., PCZM p 17); in Leskien: 'Taip tie trys vyrai šia gyveno kaip kokie kunigaikščiai. (So these three men lived here like lords. ALLL, p. 5); Leskien ... tai jie įsimetė į girę (giris), kuri ne per-toliaus nuo to miesto gulėjo. (... then they rushed into the forest which lay not too far from that town. op. cit. p. 3). Here there is an evident contrast between rushed (p) and lay statal and imperfective. A change of state will, however be represented by a change of aspect. Cf. Leskien:, ale premier

išbadėje jie tikėt prie stalo prisėdėjo ir valgė, ... (... but being absolutely famished they simply sat down at that table and ate, ... op. cit., p. 4). Here Sat down contrasts with sat or were sitting.

2.13. Difficulties arise with a group of verbs with a wide variety of meanings where one form is used for both aspects. Some of these verbs are simple, some are prefixed. The simple verb grįžti (to return) is mainly used in the unprefixated form. In Leskien: 'Bet jiems nieko pikto nenusitiko ir teip jie vėl tais pačiais takais ir keliais grįžo atgal,...(But nothing wrong happened to them so they once more returned along the same path and way,... ALLL, p 5/6). Similarly rasti (to find) is unchanged in the vast majority of cases. In Leskien we find many examples of this verb: 'Paskui radau borselį su riešutais pripilta,... (Afterwards I found a small tub full of nuts,..., ALLL, p 2) or, 'O štai, jis čia rado popieratę,... (And look, here he found a piece of paper,... ALLL p. 4). In all cases so far observed the context has been such as would normally require a perfective verb. Indeed where a single concrete notion is concerned the verb is always perfective. Another verb where we find a high proportion of examples in the simple form with perfective meaning is sakyti (to say). In Leskien: 'Aš pilns baimės sakiau:....(Full of fear I said:....ALLL p. 1), and, ...'tai unterapiciers savo sapną papasakojo ir tą pabaigęs sakė:' (then the NCO told his dream and when he had finished it said:, ALLL, p 4) It will be noticed that while sakė and papasakojo are in distributional terms perfective, only papasakojo is so marked.

2.131. Closely related to sakyti is the derived (denominative) verb pasakoti; the verb sakyti and the noun pasaka (tale, fairy-tale) are derived from a common Baltic root sak- (to say, tell); in its turn the noun pasaka has given a secondary verb pasakoti (narrate, tell). This verb forms its perfective in pa-, thus papasakoti. However, again in Leskien we find an example which may be compared with the previous examples with saké: 'Toliaus and dienos jie ir į tą sodą ėjo, apie kurį ana jumprova pasakojo ... (Furthermore during the day they went into the garden about which the young woman had spoken, ... ALLL p 5). Both saké and pasakojo refer to past acts which have been completed before the time of utterance, yet neither is formally perfective.

2.132. In some of its meanings the verb tarti (to say, utter) is a close synonym of sakyti; the divergence where it does occur appears to be a matter of register: if one is talking informally one uses sakyti whereas a more formal speech would be rendered by tarti. In the middle range they are, however, virtually synonymous and one observes the same factors operating in the case of tarti as operate in the case of sakyti and to a lesser extent pasakoti: in other words there has been a tendency to use the imperfective form in both imperfective and perfective contexts. Thus in the examples quoted above it has been left to the context to indicate the aspect of the verbs in question.

Yet sakyti, tarti, pasakoti all have normally marked perfective forms and one can construct aspectual pairs as with many other verbs, but the range covered by the formally contrastive elements is comparatively restricted. The formal criterion in each case is the

prefix pa- : i.e. sakyti: pasakyti; tarti: patarti; papasakoti.

A confirmation of the above statement can be found in a random selection from the New Testament where out of thirteen examples of the form said nine are rendered by taré and two by saké. Two versions of the Lithuanian New Testament were used and the modern variant differed not at all from the older one in most of these instances; in two instances we find taré in one and saké corresponding to it in the other. The remaining two examples were in the first person and it is here that we meet the first divergence between the old and the modern version of the New Testament. In both instances the old version has sakiau and the modern pasakiau. The Bulgarian and Macedonian equivalents corresponding to these Lithuanian forms are all perfective: for the third person reče throughout: for the first person we have the Bulgarian rekoh and kazah, and for the Macedonian rekov in both cases.

2.1311. An analysis of modern literary examples containing the verb sakyti suggest that we are once more concerned with a bi-aspectual verb and that the prefix pa- connotes an action of short duration or else a certain degree of suddenness.

The use of pa- and also the context in the following examples points to short duration (the most usual meaning of pa-): 'Kai taip pasakojo kumečiai, Linkus Baltramiejus į šoną pasivedė Tarutį, ir visi matė, kaip kažin ką pasakė.' (While the labourers were talking in this way, Linkus Baltramiejus took Tarutis aside for a moment, and all could see that he was telling him something. PCZM, p 13). And: 'Pasakė šituos žodžius tokiu ramiu balsu, jog man vėl pasirodė: juokiasi iš manęs.' (She said these words to me in

such a quiet voice that again it seemed to me that she was making fun of me. PTDZ. p 38). In the second example the duration of the action is precisely delimited by the expression 'šituos žodžius' (these words).

Again the action of speaking may be short and sharp: - Mirsite, - vél pasaké moteris,... (You will die, - the woman said once more, PTDz p 35). Actions of this type resemble closely those where the action represents the sudden resumption of the act of speaking after a silence. Such is the example from Petras Cvirka: 'Ilgai ji ten žiūrėjo, kol vél pasaké, - ko tu parėjai?... (She looked here for a long time and then once more said/ lit. until she once more said/, - Why have you returned home?... PCZM, p 15). Perfective like the above examples is the simplex: 'Aš sakiau: tamsta privalai įsimylėti'. (I said: You need to fall in love. PTDz p 41).

2.1312. Lithuanian possesses two auxiliaries meaning to begin: pradėti and imti (whose original meaning is: to take). Imti in the meaning of to begin is always followed by an infinitive and can only appear as a simplex: the normal perfective: imperfective opposition paįmti: imti is thus excluded in this particular meaning. On the other hand pradėti is only found in the compound form and may further function in the non-auxiliary role. Thus in Juozas Baltušis: 'Ir tada prasidėdavo mūsų pokalbiai'. (And then our talks would begin. PTDz p 45). Prasidėdavo is marked as frequentative past by the suffix -davo; the whole emphasis of the utterance is on the habitual nature of the action; on every visit the author paid to the doctor a certain ritual was followed. Thus the verb form must be considered imperfective despite the presence

of the prefix pra- which would normally mark the verb off as perfective. Similarly imperfective is the vb pradėti in the following example from Leskien: '... kaip jau aušt pradėjo, ...' (... as it was already beginning to dawn,...). The vb pradėjo is imperfective since the action 'was beginning to dawn' is not envisaged as complete and occurs simultaneously with a group of actions. All these actions culminate in one final pair of actions as follows:'o aš iš to krūmo tada atstojęs palikau Maskoliją ir kiemą Prūsijos, kur ir dabar tebesu. (... and I stepped back from behind the bush and left Russia and the estate and my father and all my goods and came to this village in Prussia where indeed I am still living. ALLL p 3).

In the sentence 'Šitaip prasiđėjo jos gydymas. (In this way her treatment began. PTDz p 39), the verb prasiđėjo points to an action that is completed and is consequently perfective. Also perfective is imti in an example from Leskien: 'Dabar juodu ėmė avilius kilnot,.. (Now the two of them began to raise the hives,... ALLL p 2); here 'ėmė avilius kilnot' is the first of a sequence of verbs describing the actions carried out by the two robbers in this folk tale. In the next two examples 'ėmė' appears in imperfective contexts: 'ėmė atgyti seniai pradingę noras susitikti su žmonėmis, girdėti jų balsus. (There began to revive a desire to meet people and to hear their voices which had earlier been lost. PTDz p 42) and, 'Vieni juokėsi, kiti ėmė plūsti grafą murmėti, tarpusavy ginčytis. (Some laughed, others began to reproach the count, to murmur and fight amongst themselves, PCZM p 40).

There is a further use of imti which is clearly perfective since it serves to stress a sudden resolve: ėmiau ir išvažiavau

į Londoną. (I left for London without hesitation.); 'Jie ėmė ir nušovė jį. (They shot him on the spot). Both the above examples are taken from Vilius Pėteraitis: Latviškai Angliškai Žodynas (Chicago, 1960).

2.132. If one analyses the above mentioned cases of what one may call anomalous distribution within the aspectual system the following pattern which covers a fairly wide range appears to exist. At one extreme there is only one aspectual form for the verb and this form is perfective only; Such a verb is atvykti:6. to arrive which is prefixed or rasti: to find which is unprefixal. There are other verbs which can be made perfective (in most cases with the aid of the prefix pa-); the forms without pa- can be used in both perfective and imperfective contexts. Such verbs are matyti: pamatyti (see); žiūrėti (look): pažiūrėti; sakyti (say); pasakyti; tarti (say) patarti, and with a different prefix and change in the root of the word: girdėti (hear): išgirsti. To this group one may also assign grįžti (return) which is usually unprefixal.

2.20. Before going on to discuss these anomalies in the system and the reasons why they exist, it will be appropriate at this stage to look in greater detail at the formal means which Lithuanian uses to make aspectual contrasts. The most productive method is, of course the prefix, as in Slavic.

6. It is true that beside atvykti there exists the form vykti and theoretically one could construct an opposition vykti: atvykti = eiti: ateiti, yet vykti in the non-prefixed form is comparatively rare (I).

2.21. These prefixed verbs may be divided into two classes: those where only the aspect is changed (i.e. what I have called empty prefixes) and those which change the aspect and at the same time change the meaning (again a parallel with Slavic). The commonest prefix is pa- whose affinities with the Slavic po- have already been mentioned. Like the Slavic prefix the Baltic pa- may also have the additional meaning of to do a little of; this meaning would appear to be the original one and the purely aspectual meaning has been derived from it. One can find many examples of pa- as a purely aspectual prefix. A few will suffice here for illustration; cf. in Leskien: 'Bevalgant jiems pelė pasirodė (While they were eating a mouse appeared before them. ALLL p 8). And in Juozas Baltušis: 'Patylėjo ir paprašė: ... (She fell silent and then asked:... PTDz p 47). Other prefixes may be used as an aspect marker, while in other contexts and with other lexical bases they will have their full significance, cf. Leskien: 'Tuos žodžius unterapiciers bebėgdams išgirdo...., see above 2.11.

In other cases the prefix will change the meaning of the verb as well as the aspect. Such changes occur in ateiti (come): eiti (go); įsakyti (command): sakyti (say); peršokti (jump over): šokti (jump). As in Slavic inceptive action may be indicated by a prefix; in Slavic za- is found everywhere, in Lithuanian the prefix which renders this concept is su- (normally - together with, Lat con-), cf. in Juozas Baltušis: 'Suulbo balandžiai aikštėse (In the squares the doves began to coo. PTDz - 46).

2.22. The aspectual contrast may be indicated by means of suffixes, though as a means of marking the perfective suffixation is less used in Lithuanian than in Slavic. There is in fact only one suffix

which can be used to mark this aspect, namely: -terėti/-telėti, which can be compared to R -n(u)- or B and M -ne-. In origin this suffix (-terėti is only a free variant of -telėti) served to indicate actions of very short duration; occasionally vbs with this suffix could occur in iterative contexts but in all such cases what was being marked was a series of short completed actions and not the iteration process. By their very nature actions of short duration tend to gravitate to the perfective aspect. In the same way pa- became generalised as an aspect marker. Since the similarity in meaning between verbs with the prefix pa- and verbs with the suffix -terėti is obvious an aspectual system which used pa- as a marker of perfectivity would tend also to use the suffix terėti for the same purpose. The addition of this morpheme to a verb may cause an internal change of the ablaut type in the verbal root. Three examples from Juozas Baltušis will show the perfective nature of this suffix: "Daktare! ' šūktelėjau nejučiomis." (Doctor! - I shouted all of a sudden. PTDz p 47); 'Ir moteris ramiausiu veidu pakilo, pokštelėjo lazde ir išėjo į kitą kambarį. (And the woman rose with a very calm face, clattered about on her stick and went out into the other room. PTDz p 37); 'Ramiai atsisėdo vėl savo krėslan, iš karto padėdama rankas ilsėtis ant jo atkalčių. Syptelėjo. (She quietly sat down again in her chair, letting her hands rest together on its arms. She smiled. PTDz p 35) A change from -au- to -ū- has taken place in šūktelėjau (cf. šaukiau). The contrast between šūktelėti and its corresponding imperfective verb can be seen in the following example from Leskien '... tie čia ir visi drauge degė ir visi gvoltu šaukė išgelbėjimo. (... here they were all burning together and all shouting loudly for rescue. ALLL p 5). The alternative form in

-terėti is to be seen in the following example from J. Baltušis: 'Gydytoja nušypsojo, žvilgterėjo į mane truputį skersomis. (The doctor smiled and looked at me somewhat askance. PTDz p 38). The form žvilgterėti is derived from the basic verb žvelgti; the form žvilg- is historically a reduced grade of žvelg-

2.221. From the last example it can be seen that the same verb may have more than one perfective form. There is no apparent difference between the two forms. A Russian-Lithuanian Dictionary⁷ gives for ulybat'sja šypsotis and šypčioti, and for ulybnut'sja nusišypsoti and šyptelėti. One finds the prefixed form in similar contexts to the forms in -telėti. In J. Baltušis we have: 'Ir nusišypsojo, matydama mano sumišimą.' (And she smiled seeing my confusion. PTDz p 36). In the same author we find the -telėti form of this verb which has been quoted above at 2.22. Besides žvilgterėti there is also pažvelgti. The following example (again one from Juozas Baltušis) shows how more than one type of perfective may exist side by side for the same radical morpheme: 'Dar kartą pažvelgė į mane ilgą ir tiriančią mėlyną akių žvilgsniu:...' (Once more she glanced at me with a long and enquiring glance of her blue eyes. PTDz p 42)

2.222. Empty and full prefixes.

As we have seen, Lithuanian is able to form perfective verbs from imperfective verbs by suffixing -terėti/-telėti or alternatively by prefixation. The prefixes used in forming compound verbs fall

7. Rusų Lietuvių Kalbų Žodynas, Leidykla "Mintis", Vilnius, 1967.

into two classes. These classes may be said to consist of empty and full prefixes. The time has come to look at these concepts in greater detail. Both groups of prefixes perfectivise: i.e. šypsotis: nušypsoti; pykti (grow angry): supykti; eiti (go): paeiti; išeiti (go out) daryti (do): padaryti; atidaryti (open); uždaryti (shut). Analysis of this list of verbs shows that only three (išeiti, atidaryti, uždaryti) change their meaning: išeiti: eiti - go out: go; atidaryti/uždaryti: - daryti - open/shut: do. In these examples then iš-, at(i)-, už- are full prefixes in that they transfer the simple verbs (eiti, daryti) from one lexical class to another. The prefixes nu-, su-, pa- are empty prefixes, there is no transfer from one lexical class to another. In these instances the change is grammatical and not lexical. Thus the prefixation of su- to pykti transfers pykti from the grammatical category of imperfective to the grammatical category of perfective. The functional role of these empty prefixes is to effect this transfer between these categories, and the transfer is always unidirectional - from imperfective to perfective. The suffixes -terėti/-telėti share this functional role with the empty prefixes.

The full prefixes on the other hand change the lexical meaning of the simple verb, but at the same time they change the aspectual category. The form išeiti differs from eiti in that it means go out; i.e. direction has been added to the basic concept of movement. The compound form išeiti is now a member of the lexical class containing such verbs as išbėgti (run out), ištektėti (flow out), iššokti (jump out). In grammatical terms išeiti may be assigned to the same category as paeiti (both are perfective), though they differ lexically; išeiti and paeiti differ from eiti in that the latter is imperfective.

Difficulties of classification may arise with certain prefixes: for instance, su- in suulbti might be classified as a full prefix since a new lexical element has been added to basic meaning of ulbti. Moreover, in an utterance of the type 'Balandžiai suulbo' (The doves began to coo) the prefix su- could be replaced by an auxiliary verb: cf. 1. Balandžiai pradėjo ulbti; 2. Balandžiai ėmė ulbti. Yet the prefix su- perfectivises the verb ulbti, and hence suulbti is in grammatical opposition to ulbti.

The function of su- could be described in grammatical terms were one to create an inceptive category. In fact prefixes of this type form a link between the empty prefixes which have grammatical rather than lexical significance and the full prefixes whose significance is primary lexical. Since, however, inceptive verbs are a sub-category of aspect (in this case the perfective aspect) it is more appropriate to allocate the suffix su- to the class of empty prefixes.

Other prefixes may have a specialised meaning, as for instance iš-. Iš- may be used with its spatial meaning⁸: i.e. išėjo (came/went out); išrausė (dug out); at other times it may function as an empty prefix: i.e. išgirdo (heard). The most distinctive non-spatial meaning of this prefix is, however - 'to carry out an action thoroughly' or 'to the very end'. Cf. here Riz-: iz "ezdit' (to travel all over) or ishodit' (stroll, walk all over). As in Lithuanian this usage is exclusively perfective and is more

8. The spatial meaning of prefixes such as iš-, nu-, ap- is their basic meaning when functioning as full prefixes, i.e. out of, away from, round about (cf. R iz-, ot-/u-, ob-).

restricted in R. than in L.⁹ We find examples of the prefix iš- used with this meaning in Petras Cvirka: 'išsipasakojo jam Monika...' (Monika told him to the end...PCZM p 17); 'akimis išsižiūrėjo,...' (she examined it all, op cit p 17); 'akimis išglamonėjo,...' (she caressed him all over with her eyes,... ibid p 17). All the above-mentioned perfective forms contrast with the corresponding pa- forms, and here pa- may be considered the empty perfectivising element. Both perfectives have the same imperfective form since we are not dealing here with a change in meaning but with a change in the type of action; in other words the iš-forms are Aktionsarten. The existence of more than one perfective form to the simple verb in Baltic is not unusual since it is also to be found in Latvian (see below 3.20). For the above-mentioned verbs we have the following relationships: pasakoti: papasakoti: iš(si)pasakoti; žiūrėti: pažiūrėti: iš(si)žiūrėti; galmonėti: paglamonėti: išglamonėti.

2.223. As we have seen Lithuanian uses prefixes to mark aspectual contrast, i.e. prefixes mark the perfective from the imperfective (simple) form of the verb. Again prefixes may be used to indicate certain Aktionsarten. Finally they may indicate both a change in meaning and aspect. In all the above instances the prefixed verb is formally perfective. Similarly the prefix -terėti (-telėti) is

9. This usage of iš- in L may be due to Slavic influence, through the intermediary of WR. Since, however, it is commoner in L than in R, it is reasonable to suppose that it is the result of independent Baltic development, and that any influence would have gone from L to R.

used to distinguish the perfective from the imperfective verb.

The use of prefixes in Slavic presents a basically similar pattern: i.e. prefixation (and in certain cases suffixation) renders a simple verb perfective. Thus in Russian the simple verbs *ščitat'*, *smotret'*, *pisat'*, correspond to the perfective forms *po-smotret'*, *na-pisat'*. In all these instances it is a question of the purely grammatical alternation of aspect, imperfective: perfective. With the use of other prefixes and the same verbal bases we obtain: *za-ščitat'* (reckon); *o-smotret'* (examine) and *pod-pisat'* (sign). These new perfectives agree with the first series of perfectives (*proščitat'*, *posmotret'*, *napisat'*) only in their perfectivity. They are new lexical items and thus the simple verbs *ščitat'*, *smotret'*, *pisat'* can not act as imperfectives to the new series.

If one excludes certain bi-aspectual verbs the Slavic aspectual system requires every perfective form to have a corresponding imperfective. For *zaščitat* therefore there has been created the form *zaščityvat'*, for *osmotret'* *osmatrivat'*, and for *podpisat'* *podpisivat'*. The marker of the imperfective is *iva* (*yva* is a variant). This suffix - in diachronic terms an iterative - has here a purely aspectual significance, it marks the imperfective. The frequentative form of the verb to be '*hyvat*' is still to be found with this meaning. In colloquial Russian (i) *va-* forms of other verbs are occasionally to be found: cf. *našivat'*: *nosit'*. There is an example of this usage in Babel's *Konarmija*: '*naš brat takih ne našival*' (Guys like us would never do such things)¹⁰ Similar too

10. I. Babel', p. 111.

in Polish is the expression 'pisywać do gazety' (to write for the papers, GEPD). Here it is obviously a question of a regular contribution to the papers. The iterative pisywać is in contrast with the basic form pisać.

In addition to the (i)va- forms other imperfective markers are to be found in Russian and Polish. The commonest opposition is that between -i- (p): -ja- (i); concomitant with this change is a change of conjugation (II - I).¹¹ A Russian example of this alternation is to be found in the verb 'to explain': об "jasnit'(p): об "jasnjat' and in Polish the verb 'to earn': zarobić (p): zarabiać (i); the Polish form also shows the characteristic ablaut (-rab-:-rab-) found with this type of derivational suffix.^{12,13}

More restricted are the alternation -i-: -a- and -e-: -a-. Examples of the former are verbs with a root in -~~u~~šib-, i.e. ušibit' (p): ušibat' (bruise); for -e-: -a- cf. the verbs with the root -er-;

11. The suffixation of (i)va- may lead to a change in conjugation, i.e., R ugovorit': ugovarivat' To persuade; no change of conjugation takes place in the opposition: podpisat' : podpisvat'.

12. The change resulting in the creation of a new perfective verb preceded in terms of relative chronology the creation of the new imperfective.

13. Cf. also kupit' : pokupat' where the new imperfective not only changes its conjugation but acquires a prefix, a reversal of the normal procedure.

umeret' (p): umirat' (i) (to die). An isolated example would be the simple verb brosat' (i) 'to throw' which has a perfective brosit'. Compounds of brosat' however, have an imperfective in -yvat': cf. vybrasyvat' (i) : vybrosat' (p) 'To throw out'.

2.2231. The distribution of imperfective markers in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

Among the commoner imperfectivising morphemes in Bulgarian as in East and West Slavic are forms in -v- and -ja-. -v- has three forms -ava-, -va- and the much less common -uva-. Some va-forms are to be found in the following examples: izgazvam: izvārsvam: izvārša to make, do, accomplish. In -ava-: -sedjavam: -sedja 'sit' (meaning of simplex); globjavam: globja 'to fine, mulct'; otstojavam: otstoja 'to defend', vindicate.¹⁴ An example of -uva- is the verb kupuvam kupja 'to buy'. Of the imperfectives in -ja- may be cited, izgarjam: izgorja 'to burn away, down'; zadavjam: zadavja 'to choke, suffocate'. And with a consonant alternation: predhoždam: predhodja 'to precede'. To conclude this brief picture of the distribution of imperfective markers in Bulgarian one may cite a few examples of the -a- forms: cf. umiram: umra 'to die'; sjadam: sedna 'to sit'; tikam: tikna 'to shove'; zalitam; zalitna 'to stagger'. The last group is to a certain extent an unrepresentative selection since the verbs 'to take', -biram, -bera and other common roots have been omitted. In fact this suffix is characteristic of that group of verbs of which the root ends in a consonant plus sonant.

14. Many of the above examples have been culled from Howard I. Aronsen, Bulgarian Inflectional Morphophonology, pp 92 - 104.

It is not necessary to analyse in detail the system of imperfective markers in Slavic, since enough has already been said to point to the essential polarity of perfective: imperfective that Slavic has developed. Though it has been customary to talk of the perfective as being the marked member of the perfective: imperfective opposition it is the ability to create imperfective forms that is a characteristic feature of the Slavic aspectual system. A prefixed perfective verb which did not correspond to an imperfective verb could not be termed marked since it would not be in true contrast. The tendency to derive imperfective forms from perfective forms is highly developed and inceptive verbs which may be regarded as belonging to a sub-category (Aktionsart) of the perfective are on occasion imperfectivised in the more colloquial registers, cf. *zadremyvat'* (doze off) : *zadremat'*.

In the standard language the Aktionsarten stand outside the system in so far as they do not reflect the aspectual polarity which is characteristic of the vast majority of verbs, i.e. they belong to one aspect or the other and do not form contrastive pairs. Since, however, they are found in comparatively restricted numbers they do not affect the general picture. If one turns to Lithuanian one finds a more complicated situation. Hitherto we have examined the means used to form perfectives in that language and the pattern thus revealed is not very different from Slavic. It is now time to consider the process of imperfectivisation.

2.30. Imperfectivising suffixes in Lithuanian.

Hitherto we have considered only those forms which serve to distinguish the perfective aspect from the imperfective where the

latter is not further differentiated. These consist of prefixes of which there are a large number, and one suffix -telėti/terėti. In a comparison between Baltic and any of the Slavic languages certain factors need to be considered. There are several types of aspectual systems. The distinctive characteristic of the Slavic system is the spread of aspectual concept to every part of the verb. This differs from the system of Classical Arabic, for instance, in which certain tenses are found in one aspect and not in the other. Secondly Slavic has created a systematic opposition for almost every vb. It is the existence of an imperfective to almost every perfective verb that is the basis of the system. To achieve this end certain suffixes have been generalised as imperfective formants. Many such formants can be traced back to original iteratives: cf. R nosit': nesti.

2.31. In Lithuanian too such iteratives exist; among the commoner derivational suffixes of this type is -ioti/joti. This causes palatalisation in stems ending in dentals: e.g. t > š and d > dž. As an example of this process one may take the verb vedžioti iterative to vesti (where vesti < ved-ti). This recalls the Russian vodit': vesti. In Latvian an iterative may be formed from the same verb: e.g. vadāt: vest. Though the suffix is different the process is the same; one can also see a vowel gradation which is not dissimilar to that found in R vodit': vesti (the vowels are historically cognate: IE ā CS1 o/ Balt a). J. Otrębski says of these verbs: 'Derivative verbs in -ioti, 3 pres in -ioja, are iteratives or duratives, certain of them also have a diminutive nuance.' ¹⁵ The selection of markers of imperfectivisation leads one to consider

15. (See page 40).

those suffixes which normally render such concepts which belong by their nature to the imperfective category. Thus one would prefer for instance suffixes which distinguish the factors of iteration, duration and intensiveness. The main criterion rests on the admitted conventionality of language; if native informants agree in accepting such forms as imperfective then we have here a similar type of suffix to the generalised Slavic formants of imperfectivisation.

2.32. The formant *-ioti* is not the only potential marker of the imperfective; even more productive is the suffix *-inėti*, and this suffix is cited by the Lithuanian linguist, Leonardas Dambriūnas in an article in the Polish linguistic journal, *Lingua Posnanensis*.¹⁶ The suffix *-inėti* used both with a simplex, i.e. *bėginėti* (durative) 'to keep on running' beside the basic form *bėgti*, and also with compound verbs, is met with in the 16th century in for instance the Postilla Catholica of Daukša.¹⁷ These examples among others are to be found in J. Otrębski,¹⁸ and he glosses the Lithuanian compound

15. 'Czasowniki odsłowne na *-ioti*, 3 praes. na *-ioja*, są to iterativa wzgl. durativa, po części z odcieniem deminutywnym.' J. Otrębski, *Gramatyka Języka Litewskiego*, II, see 584, p 348.

16. Leonardas Dambriūnas, 'Verbal Aspects in Lithuanian', LP7, p.259, 1959.

17. Vilnius, 1599; Mikalojus Daukša (1527/8 - 1613)

18. Op cit, Vol II p. 348.

verbs in -inėti with Polish imperfectives: thus *L išbėginėti* 'to run away' corresponds to Polish *zuciekać* and *ušbėginėti* 'run up' to *zabiegać*. In the modern language examples of this suffix are not lacking; cf. J Baltušis, '*Vaistų neišrašinėjo pati, bet reikalavo nešti jai visus receptus,...*' (She herself did not make out a prescription for medicines, but asked me to bring her all the prescriptions,... PTDz p 40). Corresponding to *išrašinėti* is the form *išrašyti*, and the two forms are sufficiently differentiated for an aspectual contrast to be made.

2.40. Many attempts have been made to systematise verbal aspect in Lithuanian. In recent times the hypothesis which provides the most adequate solution has been presented by Leonardas Dambriūnas (see above page 40 footnote 16). Following in the steps of J. Safarewicz and J. Endzelins¹⁹ he makes two statements about the Lithuanian verb; 1. one should not treat the Lithuanian verbal paradigm as integral in terms of aspect; i.e. one should not include every tense of a Lithuanian verb within the compass of one aspect, whether it be imperfective or perfective. 2. Certain verbs are indifferent with regard to aspect; there are three terms within this system: perfective: imperfective: neutral. This does not mean that Dambriūnas believes that there are more than two aspects; his neutral vbs (cf. *tarti*, *grįžti*) are normally capable of indicating either aspect without any change of form. Thus *grįžo* 'returned' will be imperfective in imperfective contexts and perfective

19. Stan badań nad aspektem czasownikowym w języku litewskim. *Balticoslavica III*, Wilno 1936. (Quoted by Dambriūnas).

in perfective contexts. Prefixed forms of these verbs do exist - in this case sugrižo - but the perfectivity is adequately expressed by the context, the prefix is redundant.

Statistically too sugrižo is the less frequent of the two possibilities. When asked to provide translations for the sentence, 'We heard he came back on Thursday.' three out of four informants preferred grižo to sugrižo.²⁰

2.41. Dambriūnas as we have seen tends to agree with both Endzelīns and Safarewicz (see above p. 41), and he maintains that difficulties arise from the fact 'that in Lithuanian there is no doublet corresponding to the Polish doublet przyjść : przychodzić or the Russian doublet priiti : prichodit''. There is no doubt that the Lithuanian doublet daryti : padaryti corresponds to the Polish robić : zrobić. However, for the first two Polish infinitives there is only one adequate Lithuanian infinitive ateiti. The question arises what is the aspect of the Lithuanian verb ateiti? Leaving this question for the moment unanswered Dambriūnas turns to the three main finite forms of the verb; in his opinion the present tense form ateina is always imperfective (despite the fact that it is prefixed) while the corresponding future ateis and preterite atėjo are always perfective. He further divides present tense forms into

20. The sentence was translated as follows:

- L.1 : Mes girdėjome, kad jis grižo ketvirtadienį.
- L.2 : Girdėjome, kad jis grižo ketvirtadienį.
- L.3 : Mes girdėjome, kad jis sugrižo ketvirtadienį.
- L.4 : Girdėjome, kad jis grižo ketvirtadienį.

two categories: those which can express actual present action and those which cannot. The first category of verbs describes actions occurring at the time of utterance and is durative. The second can express timeless action, implying perpetual, repeated or possible action: 'Sirdis dažnai pasako tai, ko galva nesupranta' (The heart often says things that the head does not understand)²¹ Here we have a verbal action which is repeated but does not refer to any segment of time. The use of the perfective present to render proverbs is also found in South Slavic, cf. SCr: Veliko drveće dugo raste, ali za čas padne, Great trees take a long time to grow but fall in a moment. Verbs of this second category may also use the present tense to express action in the past, i.e. historic present. Here again parallels may be drawn with South Slavic, cf. SCr: On sjedne na divan i pregleda jutarnje novine. He sat on the couch and looked through the morning papers. The use of the present to express past action is a common stylistic construction. Finally the perfective present may have future significance: Eimu ir pasakau (- eisiu ir pasakysiu): 'I'll go and say'. The notion of the near future is one of the characteristics of the present tense in many languages, and in East and West Slavic the perfective future has been generalised in this meaning since in neither of these language groups has been developed a tense (in either aspect) which is formally marked as future. The present is marked as future because it is perfective but it does not differ formally from the present of the imperfective which is not so marked. In Lithuanian and Latvian the future is

21. L. Dambriūnas, LP 7, p 256

marked thematically and is found in both aspects (by means of the thematic morpheme -s-) and the use of the present for the future may be regarded as a stylistic variant.²²

2.411. The division of the present into two categories is susceptible to further sub-division as follows:

Imperfective.

- a) all simple forms except verbs in -telėti and point action verbs.
- b) compound verbs: i) where there are no simple forms; ii) where prefixation creates a new word differing in meaning from the simple form; iii) where the prefix modifies the meaning (in the spatial sense) but where the meanings of the prefixed and simple forms are not totally dissimilar as in the prefixed group; in group ii) the simple verb deda (gives) is obviously unrelated to the prefixed verb pradedu (begins).

Perfective

- a) Unprefixed verbs with the suffix -telėti and the small number of point action verbs where the action is accomplished in a very short space of time.
- b) compound verbs where no change of meaning takes place. Here we find most of those aspectual pairs which may be directly compared with similar Slavic forms: cf. daryti: padaryti - robió: zrobió;

22. In SCr., Mac. and Bulg. the future is clearly marked; whether this marker be an auxiliary or a clitic it marks futurity and not aspect and may be directly compared with the Lithuanian (and Latvian) thematic morpheme -s-.

to this group must also be added those prefixes which are used in the formation of Aktionsarten.

2.420. The past tenses show a similar distribution; simple verbs are mostly imperfective with the same exceptions as for the present i.e. verbs in -telėti and point action verbs. Others are neutral; here Dambriūnas gives a fairly full list and one may add to his list (LP 7, p 236) certain synonyms of these verbs. For instance he mentions taré said as neutral and as we have seen saké is virtually interchangeable with it over a large part of the range covered by taré.

2.421. The compound past tenses are mainly perfective. Exceptions, as with the present tense forms, are those verbs which are either not found unprefixes or where the prefixed meaning differs considerably from that of the simple verbs. These verbs are imperfective or neutral (cf. 2.411. b)i) and ii). The third group in 2.411. b) are, of course, perfective. Dambriūnas lists those he considers imperfective: atrodė, pasakojo, pažinojo etc., and those he considers neutral.

2.430. The frequentative past tense can also be either perfective, imperfective or neutral. Because of its inherent meaning of a repeated or habitual action this form shows a tendency to be neutral. In certain cases we shall find a neutral frequentative past where the preterite is perfective: cf. išėjo: išeidavo; atėjo: ateidavo. Confirmation can be found in the use of this form in contexts where only the perfective is appropriate and in those cases where only an imperfective may be used. To summarise, if we take the

verb ateiti, we find that the present ateina is imperfective, the past and futuro, atėjo and ateis are perfective and the frequentative past ateidavo is neutral.

2.431. Where the present tense is perfective the frequentative past is also perfective. Thus one would have to substitute an unprefixd form for the prefixed form in imperfective contexts: cf. 'Kai senelis skaitydavo pasakas, mes vise sėdėdavom ir klausydavomės' (LP 7, p 259) 'While the old man was reading the stories, we all used to sit and listen'. In this instance paskaitydavo would be impossible. Conversely in the sentence 'Kai senelis paskaitydavo pasaky, visi eidavome gulti' (p 259): When the old man used to tell stories we used all to go off to bed'. In the last instance the imperfective skaitydavo cannot be substituted for the perfective paskaitydavo. Though the action of reading in the second example is habitual it is regarded as a series of completed actions and the action of reading is moreover limited by the use of the partitive pasaky in contrast to the accusative pasakas in the first example.

2.432. The aspectual distribution then may be summarised as follows:

- i) a simple frequentative past is imperfective, with the same exclusions as for the present, i.e. vbs in telėti and point action verbs.
- ii) prefixed verbs in frequentative past are a) perfective if the present is perfective, or b) imperfective or neutral if the present is not perfective.

2.44. Having discussed the distribution within the aspectual

system of individual tense forms Dambriūnas then turns to the suffix, -inėti. Hitherto we have considered only one suffix, -telėti (-terėti), which served to render a simple verb perfective; the simple iterative form -inėti is according to the Lithuanian author (LP 7 p 259) 'one of the most important means of expressing the imperfective aspect'. Perfective verbs with this suffix become imperfective or neutral (but, cf. also -ioti., 2.32). Only verbs which are perfective in the present tense remain perfective with this form. Past tense forms with the exception of a few forms, mostly with pa-, become imperfective or neutral when combined with this suffix.²³ Some iteratives have lost the iterative meaning but have acquired a durative significance: atsakinėjo, atsiprašinėjo, įrodinėjo, įtikinėjo (answered, made excuses, proved, asserted). The above examples are to be found in Dambriūnas at p. 260.

2.450. The forms with be-

2.451. A compound verbal form can be created by prefixing be- to either a simple or a compound verb and the participial suffix -as. the compound participle contains the idea of duration. It should be noted here that the suffixal morpheme -as is normally associated with the present, and the idea of duration inherent in the compound form may be in part derived from this association of forms. These participles are marked for durativeness but are neutral with regard

23. parašinėjo (wrote) pašokinėjo (bounded for a while), pakausinėjo (inquired about) and pavažinėjo (drove about) remain perfective, LP 7 p 259.

to tense. From the verbs *eiti* (go), *rašyti* (write), *dirbti* (work) and *išeiti* (go out) we can form the following durative participles: beeinas, berašas, bedirbas, beišeinas; the association with the present tense is further confirmed in the verb 'to go' since the thematic morpheme is marked for presentness. The form beeinas may thus be broken up into four elements: 1) be- prefix: denotes continuation; 2) ei- root of verb: 'go'; 3) -n- thematic morpheme marking presentness as opposed to pastness; 4) -as: suffixal morpheme, formally identical with the present participle.

2.452. The participle above marks duration but not tense; tense is marked as with other participial forms which function as tenses by the use of the auxiliary verb būti (to be). The tenses of the auxiliary which can be used are buvo (preterite), bus (future), būdavo (frequentative past) and būtu (conditional). The following examples are from the Lithuanian-English Dictionary of Vilius Pétėraitis (see Bibliography): 'buva beeinas, kai draugas atėjo' - I was just going as my friend came; esu bebaigęs laišką - 'I am just about to finish the letter'. The present example given above is additional to the possible tense forms quoted by Dambriūnas and while it is formally identical with the preterite, future conditional and frequentative past forms and resembles them in meaning the normal present tense form contains the idea of duration already. The participle therefore merely emphasises what is normally associated with the present tense. Both examples from Vilius Pétėraitis point to an action which is incomplete. In the first one also a clear contrast is made between the completed action kai draugas atėjo and the incompleted action buva beeinas. This type

type of verbal action has thus moved from the sphere of Aktionsart (i.e. duration) into the higher concept of aspect; the participle be- -as can be considered to have assumed additionally the functional load of aspect marker.

2.453. Following Dambriūnas one may note certain restrictions on the use of this form. The verb ateiti as we have seen has a present ateina which is an imperfective form while the past atėjo is perfective. The form yra beateinas is not in contrastive opposition with the present ateina, whereas a contrastive opposition does exist between buvo beateinas and atėjo. Similarly an imperfective future would be expressed by bus beateinas, contrasting with the perfective future ateis. On the other hand the frequentative past is less likely with this form since ateidavo is neutral and can function in both the imperfective and perfective contexts.

2.50. Analysis of neutral verbs in the preterite.

2.51. An analysis of the neutral (or bi-aspectual) verbs leads one to the conclusion that many of these verbs are characterised by certain inherent qualities which obviate the necessity for formal definition. Dambriūnas' list contains approximately fifty verbs and it is more suitable for our purpose if we divide them further into subgroups on the basis of similarity of meaning. It can be argued that the selection made by Dambriūnas includes verbs which from their meaning should perhaps be attached to one or other of the two categories (perfective or imperfective). Such being the case it would be better here to discuss further the term neutral

which he uses. In terms of meaning the neutral verbs cover a wide range: at one end they will tend towards the perfective and at the other the imperfective. They are neutral in that they may be found in imperfective contexts or perfective contexts without any change in form (i.e. without prefixation or suffixation). Any of the verbs cited may be found in perfective contexts and may be so marked, i.e. they may be prefixed (or in certain cases suffixed). Nevertheless the prefix is not essential to the change in aspect. If one were to take the verb grižti (return), the form grižo and the form sugrižo are both perfective in perfective contexts. The form sugrižo however, is only perfective and will occur only in such contexts. The form grižo on the other hand may occur in either perfective contexts or imperfective contexts and the aspect will depend on the context.

Nevertheless there are certain verbs whose basic meaning will determine the context in which it will most frequently appear. Thus certain verbs will have a tendency (and one may only speak of tendencies here) to appear in perfective aspects, while again others will show a marked preference for imperfective contexts.

2.52.

- i) two verbs connote the end of an action: baigé 'ended'.
liovési 'stopped'.

Here the resultative quality is self-evident and these verbs tend towards the perfective end of the spectrum.

- ii) There are several synonyms for seized:

šiupe

griébé

stvéré

iii) Five verbs refer to the act of falling; the main distinction lies in the violent content of the action in some cases:

krito 'fell' (the pure act; there are no undertones)

griuvo 'fell down' (additionally direction is indicated in the verb itself).

klupo 'stumbled', 'tripped'.

puolé 'fell', 'collapsed'.

virto 'fell down', 'tumbled'.

iv) There are two synonyms for rose; both are intransitive, but the second is the reflexive form of a transitive verb:

kilo (intr)

kélés (originally trans)

v) A sub-group of six verbs indicates a change of state - this may be of very short duration or it may cover a period of time:

miré 'died'

gimé 'was born'

sédo 'sat down'

stojo 'stood up'

gražino 'beautified' (here change in state of object and not subject)

žuvo 'perished'.

vi) These are contrasted with a small group where no change of state is envisaged:

liko 'remained'

tiko 'like' synonymous with the more usual compound form - patiko.



tilpo 'had/found room for'

vii) The next sub-group contains verbs connected with the act of speaking:

taré 'said'

lémé 'told'

spéjo (for ~~i~~spéjo) 'predicted, guessed'

liepé 'ordered'.

saké 'said', might be added to this list in view of the fact that it is over much of its range virtually interchangeable with taré

viii) The common feature of the majority of the verbs in this group is the idea of violence implicit in the action:

těšké 'threw violently'.

šoko 'jumped'

trūko 'burst, rent exploded'

stūmé 'thrust, shoved'

plyšo 'broke, burst, split'

spjové 'spat'

spyré 'kicked'

sviedé 'hurled'

kliuvo 'knocked against'

dūré 'pierced'

sprogo 'burst, exploded'

To this list may be added the basic verb meté 'threw' and also skyré 'divided' which is closely linked with one of the meanings of plyšo. The violence implicit in the meaning of most of the verbs of this series is absent from meté and skyré.

ix) There appears to be no common ground for the remaining verbs in Dambriūnas' list. Two are auxiliaries and in that sense they might have been allocated to a special sub-group.

stengé 'was able'

émé 'began'

In origin émé is, of course, the preterite of imti 'to take' and when used in the meaning of 'to take' it follows the normal pattern and we may find either émé or paémé depending on the context. However, in the meaning of 'began' émé is never found in the prefixed form. There is a prefixed verb 'to begin' pradėti. If one desired to stress the perfectivity of the auxiliary one could use pradėjo.²⁴ Many common auxiliaries tend to be used in the simple form; a synonym of stengé is galėjo and this is the usual form.

The remaining verbs share no features common to them all.

They are:

ryžos 'determined, decided'

peinė 'gained', 'benefited'

vedé 'led'

drįso 'risked, dared'

davé 'gave'

tesėjo 'carried out'

spruko 'slipped away'

grįžo 'returned'

leido 'let go'

kibo 'hung onto, attached oneself to'.

24. Cf. also previous discussion of these two vbs 2.1312. Both the simplex émé and the compound vb pradėjo (and other tenses of these verbs) may appear in either aspect.

It is possible to link up ryšos, driso, tesėjo and peinė.

There would be a tendency to gravitate towards the perfective end of the aspectual range, but they could be fitted quite easily into many imperfective contexts. For instance one could risk one's life on more than one occasion. Similarly one could gain or benefit from something over a considerable period of time. The action of 'letting go' could take place on one occasion or on several. The form paleido is also found with the same meaning and would be used where more definition was required. To some of these there exist iterative forms: davė: davinėjo; vedė; vedžiojo, and these would be used to stress the imperfective iterative element. An example of vedžiojo in this usage occurs in Petras Cvirka, 'Monika jau kelintas vakaras zulinu alkunėmis stalą, prisiglaudusi prie vyro, kuris dešinės smiliumi vedžiojo knygoje.' 'Already on several evenings Monica would wear out (rub) the table with her elbows, leaning against her husband, who was running the index finger of his right hand over a page of the book' (PCZM p 60).

2.53. In general terms one may say that the verbs classified as neutral by Dambriūnas have the potential of either aspect without any formal distinction being necessary. Within the groups certain tendencies are to be found in Russian in the same class: e.g. the verb sidet 'to sit', 'be sitting' is basically durative. If one wishes to infer that the action, though statal, was of short duration and had been completed before another action commenced, one would use the prefixed form of the same verb: cf. 'On posidel minutožky,... The Lithuanian verb sėdėti may be used the same way: 'Jis trumputėlį pasėdėjo,... Similarly there is a prefixed form paliko proposed to

like which appears in the list which would mean 'remained for a short while'. Nevertheless the prefixed forms of the verbs in this list, where they exist, have proportionally a much lower frequency than the simple form.

2.54. In direct contrast to the statal verbs which show a preference for the imperfective we find at the other ~~ends~~ of the neutral verb types (largely in sections (v) and (viii)) a group of vbs whose distribution shows an equally marked preference for the perfective. These verbs form a link between the class of neutral vbs as a whole and the point action verbs. Despite their similarity to the point action verbs these neutral verbs can be found in either aspect. As Dambriūnas says (LP 7 p 257): "This can be explained by three circumstances. First of all, such verbs do not represent a very short action equal to a mathematical point. For instance, sprogimas 'explosion' may last only for one moment, but it can be somewhat longer, and therefore sprogo can have both aspects. It can be used to translate both Polish pekł and pekał. Secondly such verbs can be used as iteratives, in which case they take on an imperfective meaning, e.g. 'Žmonės tada mirė it lapai rudeni krito.' Here mirė 'died' means 'died one after another, many people died'... Finally these verbs can mean not merely the transition from one state to another but also the last moments before the transition. Mirė can mean not only 'died', 'became dead', but also 'was in his last moments of life'...²⁵ These statements cannot be made about the small group of point action verbs which will be treated briefly in

25. This last statement recalls the oft quoted apology of Charles II on his deathbed for being an unconscionable time a-dying.

the next section.

2.60. The point action verbs:

2.61. The so-called point action verbs are a much smaller group than the neutral verbs, and they share certain attributes with verbs in -teléti. A verb such as dingo 'disappeared' expresses an instantaneous change from one state to another, from 'being present' to 'not being present'. A contrast is set up between the state previous to the verbal action and the state after the action has taken place. Stress is laid on the minimal quantity of time within which the action takes place. Similarly the verbal action of 'finding' may be contrasted with that of 'looking for something', which may take some considerable time. An example of the use of rasti 'to find' where the idea of instantaneousness is particularly stressed comes from Leskien: *O štai, jis šia rado popieratę* ' (And look, here he found a piece of paper, ALLL p 4). The verb gavo 'obtained' expresses a similar type of verbal action to rado 'found', where the instantaneous acquisition of some object is stressed rather than the regular occurrence of the act. The act of 'shooting' expressed in the past šovė covers virtually the same duration of time as the action of 'disappearing' in the form dingo.

2.62. Certain verbs in this group are open to a wider interpretation. The form tapo 'became' may refer to the rapid transition from one state to another, on the other hand the idea of a process of some duration is conceivable in some contexts. Laimėjo 'won' may refer to more than one occasion. The preterite spėjo is obviously

perfective since the idea of 'arriving' is reinforced by that of 'on time'; again, however, it could refer to an action that took place frequently. One could say, for instance, "The train always arrived on time".²⁶ 'Arriving' took place more than once, but on each occasion this action was completed within a specific limit.

2.63. In the group of neutral preterites we find the form davé 'gave'. Dambriūnas contrasts this with the form dovanojo 'presented, gave a present', in origin a denominative from the noun dovana 'gift'. Both are found most frequently without a prefix, yet dovanojo is considered a point action verb. This seems arguable, and it would be possible to class it with davé. An example of the prefixed form is found in J. Baltušis: 'Prieš šešiasdešimt metų ši liūtų man padovanojo žmogus' (Sixty years ago a man made me a present of this lion. PTD p⁴⁸). The prefix emphasises not only the result which is already implicit in the verb, but that it happened on one specific occasion.

2.64. The remaining verbs in this section are all synonyms whose basic idea is 'dealt a blow'. The base verb in this group is smogé 'struck'. The verbs drožé, kirto, pylé, rėžé, skėlé, žiebé have this meaning when they are synonyms of 'smogé', elsewhere they may have slightly different meanings; for instance skėlé normally means 'split' or 'cleave' and is the transitive constituent of the opposition which contains the verb skyré 'divided'. In the meaning 'dealt a blow' it would be found in such constructions as 'Jis skėlé

26. Traukinys visuomet spėjo.

broliui į dantis' (He punched his brother in the teeth). Again as in the case of spėjo, the action may be repeated, but each action is entire in itself and characterised by its short duration. There may be doubtful examples such as dovanojo (see 2.63.) but the majority of the verbs in this section share the common attribute of instantaneous action or action which is of extremely short duration.

2.70. The suffix -telėti.

2.71. In contrast to the previous group where it was the basic meaning of the verb which determined its allocation to a class, namely the class of point action verbs, the distinctive feature of the -telėti-class is the suffixal morpheme. The root morpheme with this suffix not specifically determined. The verb 'to cry out, to shout', rikti is contrasted with another form in-telėti, riktelėti. An example of the use of riktelėti occurs in Petras Cvirka, 'Motina riktelėjo porą kartų, smarkiai ir skausmingai'. (The woman cried out once or twice, vehemently, in pain. PCZM p 26). The sentence describes an event during the birth of Monica's son. The action is repeated more than once, but it is clear from the context that each 'shout' is of short duration.

2.72. It is possible to collect many pairs of this type from contemporary literature. The following are from Petras Cvirka, the preterites of the non-suffixed forms²⁷ are given for comparison

27. non-suffixed forms are those which do not have the suffix -telėti. In the above list both krūpčiojo and kumščiojo are derivative verbs, the latter from the noun kumštis 'fist'.

(The numbers in brackets refer to the pages in the novel where these forms occur).

krūptelėjo (75) 'startled': krūpčiojo

riktelėjo (26, 60) 'cried out': riko

smilktelėjo (16) 'began to ache, sting': smilko

šuktelėjo (89) 'shouted': šaukė

kumštelėjo (75) 'pushed': 'jostled with the fist,': kumščiojo

2.721. Hitherto all the examples have been given in the preterite, but they may equally well appear in the frequentative past. For instance on p 73 we have šyptelėdavo; corresponding to this (and also in the frequentative past) is šypsodavo. All verbs with the suffix -telėti are perfective since this is implicit in the meaning of the suffix. They may not in every case constitute the only perfective form of a particular verb. A perfective may be formed by prefixation based on the imperfective equivalent of the verb in -telėti. The last mentioned verb šyptelėdavo is an example of this; beside the infinitive šyptelėti we also find the prefixed form nušypsoti. Similarly rikkti has surikkti beside riktelėti; here the prefix su- gives this verb an inceptive form, i.e. surikkti 'to begin to shout'. It is interesting to note that the Russian-Lithuanian Dictionary gives²⁸ the following alternatives for R zakričat': su-rikkti, riktelėti; sušukkti, šuktelėti. If the forms in -telėti are to be regarded as even near equivalents to the forms in su-, they must be rendered as 'to utter a shout'.

2.722. A statement can be made about the suffix -telėti, namely that it may be added to a verbal root and will make the subsequent

creation perfective. Originally forms in -telėti had a specialised meaning which stressed the lack of duration of a particular action, but it would be more accurate to describe its use in the modern language as a perfectivising suffix which may potentially indicate the instantaneous nature of an action in certain contexts.

2.723. The Slavic form -nēti indicated and still does indicate single action. In the course of time it has acquired a purely perfectivising value and has spread to other verbs where the semelfactive meaning is not present. The suffix -telėti, while slightly different in meaning can be said to have undergone the same fate. Both -nēti (where -nēti stands for all modern reflexes of the suffix) and telėti still retain in part their original meaning.

2.80. Imperfectivising suffixes.

2.81. Like the suffix -telėti, -inėti possessed a specialised meaning - it was an iterative suffix, and when added to a simple imperfective verb no aspectual change will be made though the verb has now become more specialised. At the top of page 43 of Zemė Maitinoja (see bibliography), we find the following example: '... smalsumo pagauti klausinėjo.' (... overcome by curiosity they questioned him). An intensive-iterative element is clearly present and this is further confirmed by the first part of the utterance 'smalsumo pagauti...'. On page 43 of the same work there are two further examples: 'Tarutis sukinėjos miestėlyje ir žiūrinėjo,

kas čia bus.' (Tarutis took a turn about the small town and looked around to see what would happen). The contrast here is between sukti 'to turn': sukinėti(s) 'to turn in several directions', and žiūrėti 'to look': žiūrinėti 'to look around'.

On page 44 there occurs bėginėgo opposed to the simple verb bėgo: of. '... kuriuose bėginėgo žmonės' (in which the people kept running about). Further on pages 23-24 we find the sentence 'jis gaudėsi, puldinėjo.' (He played tag and tumbled about), here puldinėti is an iterative of pulti 'to fall down'. All these verbs show a modification of the verbal action without a change of aspect having taken place; they remain imperfective throughout. Klausinėti, sukinėti(s), žiūrinėti, bėginėti, puldinėti may be considered Aktionsarten of klausti, sukti, žiūrėti, bėgti and pulti. As such they are potential aspectual formants.

2.820. The suffix -inėti with perfective verbs.

2.821. In a passage from Juozas Baltušis we find an instance of this suffix being attached to a prefixed verb: 'Taip prasidėjo mūsų pažintis. Po savaitės ji atidžiai peržiūrėjo tyrimų rezultatus, skaitė ir perskaitinėjo receptus, suglėbė juos įsūnė ir stumtelėjo man.' (In this way our acquaintance had begun. After a week she carefully looked through the results of the examinations, she read and read through the prescriptions, gathered them together in a pile and shoved them over to me PTD p 36). The formal contrasts between peržiūrėjo and perskaitinėjo is striking, the more so that both verbs use the same prefix per- which would normally assign them both to the same aspectual category. Even had prefixation not been

the principal means of creating perfectives from simple verbs, the meaning of per- (through) would tend to make any verb to which it was joined a perfective one. Thus perskaitė (read through) would normally infer that the act of reading was finished. Here the use of the suffix inėjo suggests that the ~~act of 'reading'~~ was repeated. Moreover, the juxtaposition of skaitė and perskaitinėjo suggests that the prescriptions were not only read, they were read more than once and read thoroughly. In fact the suffix -inėjo stresses the idea of thoroughness which is also a meaning of the prefix per-.

2.822. The addition of -inėjo, whether one attributes to it an intensive or an iterative value, produces a certain modification of the verbal action which makes the choice of the perfective impossible. An intensive value for -inėjo would make the action itself of interest: i.e. the doctor went through the prescriptions thoroughly. It is known that she finished going through them since she made a pile of them and shoved them over to the narrator, but this fact is not of great importance. On the assumption of an intensive value for the suffix inėjo in this example one would assign this verb to the imperfective category. In addition to the intensive value it is also possible to deduce an iterative value for this suffix, which would likewise confirm our choice of the imperfective as the correct category of the verb perskaitinėjo in this example. Thus a firm allocation to one or other of these two Aktionsarten is not necessary since both are sub-categories of the imperfective aspect.

Again in Petras Cvirka there is the sentence: 'Siek tiek suraukęs kaktą Juras atsakinėjo, nurodinėjo. (Knitting his brows a little Juras answered her questions and pointed things out to her. PCZM p 66) In the preceding sentences the amazement of Juras' wife at the

spectacle is described. 'Everything appeared to her as in a dream (Monikai viskas buvo kaip sapne). She is as a result continually asking her husband questions both as to what is happening and also where things are. To these continuous questions he has to keep on answering and he has also to keep on pointing things out to her. From the foregoing it is clear that we are dealing with an iterative verb in both cases. One may then deduce the following aspectual oppositions: atsakinėti: atsakyti and nurodinėti: nurodyti.

A further example of atsakinėjo from Petras Cvirka: 'Monika sumušusi atsakinėjo ir galvojo,...' (Monica, confused, answered them and thought,... PCZM p 89). Again we are concerned with a repeated action. She answered in effect several requests to be allowed to sit next to her on a bench.

Again in Petras Cvirka we meet the form išdavinėjo: 'Dar tik vakar mūs kunigai iš sakyklų viešai išdavinėjo patriotų pavardes žandarams' (Yet only yesterday our priests were openly giving out the names of such patriots to the gendarmes. PCZM p 35). And once more on page 37 of the same novel there is an example with išsisukinėjo: '.... ir prispirtas Monikos, išsisukinėjo kad paslydęs ir susimušęs.' (... and compelled by Monica he would tell lies, saying he had slipped and struck against something.) Both verbs suggest an action that took place frequently, repeatedly i.e. the priests on more than one occasion gave out the names of patriots, and that Juras told lies to several people and on more than occasion. Of the same type is the form neįkalbinėjau: 'Aš atrėžiau, kad jų neįkalbinėjau, o pasakiau, kaip kituos kraštuos ... kad ir darbininkas puikiai žino, ko jam reikia.' (I retorted that I was not encouraging them, and I said that... as in other countries the worker too knew

perfectly well what he needed. PCZM p 53). In this sentence we have three prefixed verbs but a contrast has been established between atrėjiau, pasakiau and neikalbinėjau. This contrast is both formal and notional. The verb form neikalbinėjau describes a process and not a result, and this process is marked by the contrastive element -inėjau.

2.90. The Lithuanian Aspect System: Summary.

2.91. A comparison of the Lithuanian system and the aspect systems of the various Slavic languages shows that the former is more complex or not yet finally systemised. One of the most striking features distinguishing The Lithuanian system from the Slavic systems is the existence of a large class of what L. Dambriūnas has called neutral verbs. These verbs correspond to the bi-aspectual verbs of Slavic and it would be possible to use this term to describe this group of Lithuanian verbs. All neutral verbs may occur with prefixes and one may find Slavic bi-aspectual verbs directly corresponding to the Lithuanian verbs: sėdėti, stovėti, gulėti, matyti correspond to Slavic (R) sidet', stojat', ležat' and videt'. Though the prefix may not be the same (Lithuanian prefers pamatyti whereas Russian has uvidet') the prefix will tend to suggest, not mere perfectivity (i.e. as contrasted with imperfectivity) but rather one of the perfective Aktionsarten. What is noteworthy about Lithuanian is not the existence of such bi-aspectual forms but their number and distribution. For instance grįžti (return) and mirti (die) are bi-aspectual in Lithuanian, whereas the Slavic equivalents are not (cf. R vozvraščat'sja: vozvratit'sja/vernut'sja and umirat': umeret'). The Lithuanian bi-aspectual verbs may be said to have

resisted the aspectual polarity which has affected the vast majority of Slavic verbs.

2.911. The point action verbs are another group of simple vbs which have resisted this aspectual polarity. While the neutral vbs are biaspectual, i.e. the selection of aspect depends uniquely on the context and not on form, the point action verbs are confined to the perfective aspect. Though with regard to aspect they may be compared with verbs in -telėti, all the latter have a corresponding imperfective form which may be a simplex or it may have a suffix other than -telėti. Point action verbs have no imperfective form. If one takes as an example of the point action verbs the vb dingti (disappear) (cf. Petras Cvirka, p 10 :Žmogus dingo pakalnėje) we find that the act of 'disappearing' is regarded as an instantaneous act and hence the perfective is the only possible aspect. Yet in Russian we find the normal polarisation: isšezat' : isšeznut'. If one consults a Russian-Lithuanian Dictionary under isšezat', one finds the following Lithuanian equivalents: nykti, dingti, slėptis, žūti; again under isšeznut' (the perfective form of this verb) dingti, žūti, pasislėpti, išnykti and panykti etc... Both slėpti and nykti are normal imperfective verbs and form their perfective in the usual way by prefixation. Neither dingti nor žūti form their perfective in this way; dingti is always perfective while žūti (at least according to Dambriūnas) is neutral. In meaning they are not dissimilar: dingti: to disappear, vanish, be lost and žūti: to perish, die; (of things) to be lost (of people) to be missing. In the military sense of 'to be missing' one may use either verb. Of the two verbs, however, žūti has more figurative meaning; dingti

suggests a sudden transition from being visible to being invisible. Such is the meaning of dingo in the example from Petras Cvirka where the man is suddenly lost from view down the slope. It is difficult for that reason to associate dingti with the R imperfective verb except in cases where the act of 'disappearing' took place more than once. Where the act of 'disappearing' was other than instantaneous one would of necessity use a verb meaning 'to fade, to diminish',²⁹ such as the verb nykti meaning 'to become less, to shrink' or sléptis 'to hide oneself' (cf. R. skryvat'sja). In perfective contexts nykti and sléptis occur as translations of R isčeznut in situations which differ little if at all from that of dingti in the example from Petras Cvirka (PCZM p 10). Thus 'On isčez v tolpe' is rendered 'Jis pranyko, pasislépé minioje'; and in a more figurative usage: 'strah isčez': 'baimé išnyko.' If one substituted dingo in the first example, 'Jis dingo minioje' one would have a similar context to the example of Cvirka: Zmogus dingo pakalnėje. In both cases the disappearance is instantaneous. It is this quality of instantaneousness that is inherent in the verb dingti. It is not marked in any of the substitutes; dingo is perfective and instantaneous; pranyko and pasislépé are marked only for perfectivity.

2.912. As a category the point action group is by its nature

29. No instance of the perfective usage of dingti occurs with a prefix whereas žuti has a purely perfective form pražūti; pražūti is found as a translation of the R perfective pogibnut,³⁰ though the simple form is also found in this meaning.

restricted to only a few verbs, and some of these may not with absolute certainty be assigned to it. If one takes dingti as the type of verb one certain fact emerges dingti is never pre-fixed. One cannot apply this criterion to the verb rasti 'to find'. Though it is true that the verb rasti is found in the simple form in the majority of perfective contexts the compound form surasti cannot be excluded, cf. in Juozas Baltušis (TKN - 56): Tolimame pagirysje surado žmonės mokytoją. "In the distant edge of the woods the men discovered the teacher". Similarly one finds atrasti. As a translation of the Russian 'Obnaruzilis' poterjannye den'gi' one would use atsirasti: "Atsirado pamestieji pinigai". Again when some native speakers of Lithuanian translated the sentence "The game-keeper picked up the burnt rags and believed that he had found the cause of the recent fire" - three out of four preferred a compound form to the simple form; the choice was: suradęs; surado; atrado; and one only selected radęs.³⁰ On the basis of this evidence it would be more appropriate to assign the verb rasti to the class of neutral verbs. Nevertheless the verb rasti will function more often as a point action verb. The use of the prefix will signal the successful completion of a search rather than the mere act of

30. L1. Eigulys pakėlė sudegusius škurlius ir galvojo, kad surado paskutiniojo gaisro priežastį.

L2. Girininkas pakėlė apdegusiuosius skudurus ir patikėjosi, kad jis bus suradęs paskutiniojo gaisro priežastį.

L3. Eigulys pakėlė nuo žemės apdegusiuosius skudurus ir tikėjosi, kad atrado neperseniausiai įvykusio gaisro priežastį.

L4. Zvėrininkas pakėlė apdeguosius skudurus ir tikėjosi radęs neseniai buvusiojo gaisro priežastį.

finding, which could often be accidental.

2.913. Unlike the two previous groups of verbs whether neutral simplex or point action vbs there exist according to Dambriūnas two groups of prefixed verbs which are either imperfective or neutral. Hitherto we have been concerned with verbs which are normally unprefixed and when the prefixed form is found it is clearly perfective. The prefixed verbs in these two groups are either not used without prefixes or the corresponding unprefixed verb may be totally unrelated in meaning (cf. *tarti* 'say' and *įtarti* 'distrust, suspect'). L. Dambriūnas' list contains about forty-five verbs, the largest group again being neutral. Forms of the neutral group are according to Dambriūnas imperfective when they are used figuratively. Thus *išdavė* when it means 'betrayed' and not when it means 'gave out'. They are imperfective when they are iterative (or rather when they are in an iterative context): *Darata įtarė pana*. "Darata used to suspect the master". It is interesting to note here that Dambriūnas puts forward *įtarinėjo* as an alternative to *įtarė* in this context. As we shall see, many of these verbs may take this suffix and that we have in effect the opposite tendency to that of the simple neutral verbs. With the simple neutral vbs the perfective was specially marked, here it is the imperfective that is specially marked.

2.92. It is in the use of this suffix *-inėjo* (infin, *-inėti*) and also on occasion *-iojo* (*-ioti*) that we can see the growth of a system of aspectual oppositions. Of the two suffixes *-inėti* is the commoner and seems to have become even more productive of

recent years. As a translation of Russian 'pribyvat' Rusy-Lietuvių Kalbų Žodynas gives both ateidinėti and atvykti. Yet atvykdinėti certainly exists and one would have expected to find it here. There is, however, still a certain amount of disagreement among native speakers with regard to this form. For instance the sentence, 'He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.' has been variously translated by different informants and a fifth on being consulted suggested a further alteration. 'He was running...' was rendered on two occasions by 'Jis lakstė...'; the other two informants suggested respectively: Jis bėginėjo... and Jis bėgiojo... The second verb 'busying himself' has been rendered in three cases by the participle in -damas: dirbdamas and (twice) užsiiminėjo (the imperfective form of užsiimti: to busy oneself with). The first 'he was running to and fro' concerns movement which is both repeated and in different directions; 'busying himself now with this, now with that' is an action of a certain degree of intensity though not necessarily of an orderly nature. In neither case are we envisaging the action as completed, though in fact a series of small actions have been completed. The forms bėgiojo (ran to and fro) and lakstė (flew about) adequately translate the meaning of the first verb, the to and fro is already inherent in the meaning of the vb, though this is also implied by 'iš vienos vietos į kitą'; in the case of lakstė (flew, flitted about) this phrase has been rendered by 'šen ir ten'. A further informant suggested that the iterative nature of the first action might be further emphasised by the use of the suffix -inėjo, thus lakstinėjo. All these forms are imperfective: bėgiojo, bėginėjo lakstė, lakstinėjo. The action of the second half of the sentence

is also imperfective and where a finite verb has been used the translator has used the -inėjo form of the compound verb 'užsiimti'. A similar type of sentence is the following: 'The shop door was constantly opening and shutting'. The action of both verbs is continuous and again we find the form in -inėti: Krautuvės durys visą laiką atsidarinėjo ir užsidarinėjo (L 1). Two other informants (L2 and L4) use a participial form: Parduotuvės durys buvo nuolat atidarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos, Parduotuvės durys visą laiką buvo atidarinėjamos... The fourth hesitates between the participial usage and the preterite: buvo atidarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos/atsidarinėjo ir užsidarinėjo.

This sentence may be compared with the following: 'The door shut and she heard somebody coming upstairs.' In this instance there is complete agreement on the use of the perfective in translating the 'The door shut...': durys užsidarė (L 1, L3, and L 4) and užsidarė durys (L2). They are divided on the aspect of heard: girdėjo (twice): išgirdo (twice).³¹

2.93. The evidence which has been considered so far has tended to reinforce the view that the Lithuanian aspect system is newer in relative terms than the Slavic system. The essential feature of the Slavic system is a rigid grammatical polarisation as between imperfective and perfective. Here one finds only a limited number

31. The verb girdėti like matyti may be considered bi-aspectual though possessing a purely perfective component (in this case išgirsti); girdėti: išgirsti and matyti: pamatyti are in a similar relationship to that of the R pair videt': uvidet'.

of bi-aspectual verbs (prefixed and simplex) cited by L. Dambriūnas.

2.94. Lithuanian has had for many centuries very close links with the closely related E. Baltic language, Latvian, and it would not be surprising if there were many similarities between them. Both languages have undoubtedly been influenced by Slavic, though, outside the field of lexis, this influence is difficult to define. Moreover in distinguishing between the two aspects both have made use of inherited material. Before passing on to consider the interaction of tense and aspect in these languages and in Slavic we must consider the Latvian aspectual system.

3.0. Aspect in Latvian

3.1. The Latvian aspect system shows many similarities with the Lithuanian. We do not find the clear polarisation of the Slavic systems: thus the forms of any Latvian verb may be designated imperfective or perfective, but not every La vb necessarily possesses imperfective and perfective forms. It is in the creation of the perfective that the La system diverges least from the system established for Lithuanian, and it would be better here to consider first the type of marker used to make this distinction.

3.120. The creation of perfective forms from imperfective forms.

3.121. The normal method of deriving p forms from i vbs is prefixation. These prefixes may have lost their original spatial meaning and become merely markers of aspect; alternatively the spatial meaning of the prefix may have survived, or the prefixed form may possess some other specialised meaning (i.e. it may be used to render one of the Aktionsarten). Theoretically any prefix may be used to derive a p vb. In fact four prefixes sa-, no-, iz- and pa- (Sl s-, ot-, iz and po-) are preponderant in the function of aspect markers. As aspect markers they lose their spatial meaning:

La lasīt : izlasīt
mirt : nomirt
darīt : padarīt
maksāt : samaksāt

R čitat' : pročitat'
umīrat' : umeret'
dēlat' : sdēlat'
platīt' : zaplatīt'

3.122. Any other prefix may occur in this role though these are less likely to lose their spatial meaning. Thus risināt (solve): atrisināt. V. Staltmane in her article Verbu veidi mūsdienu latviešu literarajā valodā, p 14. (Valodas un literatūras inst. raksti, VII) gives two examples of the use of this verb in either aspect. First in the imperfective: 'Audzinātājiem jāparāda... kā vislabāk risināt uzdevumus matematikā... PLSk 1952, 1, 32. (Teachers have to show.. how best to solve problems in mathematics..) And in the perfective: 'Tiem katram sava neatbildēts un neizskaidrots jautājums... ko atrisināt pašam nebij pa spēkam.' AUPLm, 45. (They each had their own unanswered and unexplained problems... which they found themselves unable to solve).

We also find the following prefixes used as aspect markers: aiz-, aizjūgt (: jūgt, to yoke); pār-, pārtulkot (: tulkot, to translate); ap-, apģērbt (: ģērbt, to put on, trans); is-, iedzelt (: dzelt, to sting).

3.123. The basic meaning of the prefix may lead to its selection as an aspect marker with certain verbs: sa- (L su-, Sl s-) denotes union or combination. of. sa-lasīt (to gather)

sa-vākt (to collect)

sa-šķeterēt (to twist or spin).

iz- on the other hand points to a process of selection: iz-lasīt (to select) or result (iz-šķeterēt).

no- is associated with the idea of death or impairment in subject or object, and as a result it is used as a marker for the vb mirt (to die).

pa- (as in Lithuanian or Slavic) frequently points to an action as being of short duration: e.g. *zūst*, but 'to disappear for a short while' is *pa-zūst*.

3.20. Polysemy of perfective aspect prefixes.

3.21. It can be seen from the above examples that a simple vb (in the vast majority of cases the imperfective verb) may correspond to more than one perfective form. One of these perfective forms functions as the normal perfective of the simple verb in question, the other perfective forms impart definition to a particular characteristic of the action. Thus the prefix *pa-* infers that the action of the verb is of short duration (cf. also L *pa-*, Slavic *po-*). *Sa-* and *ie-* point to the beginning of an action (cf. L *su-* and R *za-*). Such abstractions belong to the sub-category of *Aktionsarten* and in Latvian they are capable of expressing a considerable range of meaning. Since the prefixes have in such instances been de-semanticised,³² the new meaning (of *Aktionsart*) may have little if any connection with the original meaning of the prefix. The meanings of *ie-* (in) and *sa-* (together) are no longer present when these prefixes are used to form inceptive verbs. The prefix *iz-* may mean 'to have one's fill of...' as in the following example. The vb *skriet* (to run) has the iterative form *skraidīt*, yet the compound form *izskraidīties* means 'to have one's fill of running'. Similar is the compound vb *nostāvēties*

32. i.e. they have lost their original spatial meaning and now have a purely aspectual significance, or serve (as in the case of *Aktionsarten*) to emphasise some non-spatial meaning.

in the sentence 'Vipš nostavejās rinda' (He was fed up with queuing).

3.220. The prefixed form retains the basic meaning.

3.221. The use of the prefix as an aspect marker, or within the aspectual category as a marker of Aktionsarten is essentially secondary. The original meaning of the vast majority of prefixes is a spatial one in that the prefix corresponds to a preposition with a spatial meaning: thus the prefixes aiz-, iz- and pār- have the spatial meanings of the prepositions aiz, iz and pār to which they correspond formally. The creation of compound verbs where these prefixes retain their original meaning can be considered the primary use of such prefixes: i.e. izvilkt (to drag out), nosviest (to throw away), palīst (to crawl under) and salīmēt (to stick together). As a result of the development of the use of the prefixes as aspect markers all such compound vbs are formally at least perfective.³³

The compound verbs we considered earlier were also perfective but there each perfective form corresponded to a simple form. Thus mirt (imperfective) corresponds to nomirt, apmirt and indeed izmirt (die out), though the last is a less happy example since izmirt (to

33. Certain compound verbs may be found in both imperfective and perfective contexts and may thus be considered formally perfective. Most compound verbs are, however, both formally and functionally perfective since they have a separate imperfective form.

die out), should be looked upon as a new formation, since it has been transferred to a different lexical set. The form *izmirt* does, however, provide a link with the opposition *iziet* : *iet*. The form *iziet* contrasts with *iet* in respect of its perfectivity, as does *palet*, though one must regard the relationship of *iziet* : *iet* as being on a different level. The relationship here is lexical rather than grammatical. On the lexical level *iet* is not the imperfective form of *iziet* any more than it is the *i* form of *uziet* (ascend) or *ieiet* (go in). There is thus in Latvian no comparable aspectual pair to the R *vyjti* : *vyhodit'* or B *podpisvam* : *podpiša* or indeed L *išavedžioti* : *išvesti* (deduce).

In Slavic and to more limited extent in Lithuanian *i* forms of compound verbs have been derived with the aid of iterative suffixes, or in one group of verbs by the substitution of the iterative member of a pair of vbs, i.e. *prinesti* : *prinosit'* in Russian, where *nosit'* was originally the iterative member of a pair of which the non-iterative was *nesti*. In this opposition there are traces of an old ablaut distinction as well as an iterative suffix (-*iti*). With most verbs, the Slavic languages have had recourse to another iterative suffix: i.e. R and Pol/*iva*/, to form imperfective verbs. Thus to the Russian simple verb *pisat'* we have the compound *zapisat'* (to write down, note) and a corresponding new form *zapisyva-t'*. Similarly in Lithuanian we have *rašyti* : *užrašyti* : *užraš-iné-ti*. Bulgarian and Macedonian have generalised -*va*- forms as in E and W Slavic. In Bulgarian one finds -*va*- and -*uva*-, while Macedonian has a majority of -*uva*- forms. Though the suffixes mentioned above are not the only suffixes used in Slavic or in Lithuanian the derivational process is the same in all cases, i.e. a suffix (originally iterative or intensive) has been

used to mark the imperfective of compound verbs. Moreover, this process is common to Slavic and Lithuanian, but not, as we shall see, to Latvian.

The question may well be asked whether there are such suffixes in Latvian which could function in this role. Certainly since iterative and intensive verbs do exist; in Latviešu Valodas Grammatika, J. Endzelins lists some iterative and intensive verbs of which only a selection is presented here:

a) -ēt (LVG 640)

ravēt, intens (to weed) : raut (to jerk, pull)

drašket, intens (to tear apart)

b) -āt (LVG 647)

nesāt or nasāt, iter (to carry) : nest

tekāt, iter (to run to and fro) : tecēt

c) -āt (with lengthened grade of the root, LVG p 819)

mētāt, iter (to throw repeatedly) : mest

lekāt, iter (to hop, jump) : lekt

d) -īt (with lengthened grade in some stems, LVG 655)

vartīt, iter-intens (to roll, drag about on the ground)

graizīt, iter (to cut repeatedly) : griezt

e) -stīt (LVG 659)

dastīt, iter, EH., "gebe wiederholt";

karstīt, iter Bielenstein, II, 403; "fasse wiederholt".

f) -dīt (LVG 659)

skraidīt, iter (to run) : skriet

šaudīt, iter (to shoot) : šaut.

g) -ināt (LVG 667): the spread of iteratives to this suffix may have been due to the influence of forms in -āt. Similarly some vbs in -ināt may in effect be derived from original forms in -inēt (a suffix now no longer found in the standard language). Through the forms in -inēt we have a link with L forms in -inēti, and it is noteworthy that many L iteratives in -inēti gloss La iteratives in -ināt; cf the following examples:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| darināt | (Bielenstein, L Spr., I, 424), cf. L darinēti
iterative to daryti (d6) |
| dāvināt | ibid., cf L davinēti: duoti (give); |
| kāpināt | ibid., (to raise, increase) : kāpt; cf. L kopinēti
(to climb): kopti (climb); the La vb is also causative
whereas L kopinēti is merely iterative, both are
transitive. |
| klaudzināt | (to knock, bang): klaudzēt |
| klupināt, | Bielenstein, op cit., I 425. (to stumble); cf. L
klupinēti; Vilius Pétėraitis (LAZ/60) gives klupiniuoti
in this meaning, corresponding to the non-iter klupti. |
| lupināt | (to peel, pare): lupt; cf. L lupinti/lupinēti. |
| urbināt | (Bielenstein, op cit., I 426), to poke, to prod, to
pick); urbt (to bore). |
| vilcināt | (to delay, drag out defer): vilkt (to pull, drag);
this is a durative intensive rather than iterative. |

- virināt (to keep opening and shutting); vērt vaļā (to open);
vērt ciet (to shut). and with inserted -d-:
dzeldināt (to sting), 24548 (LTDz): dzelt (to sting);
dzidināt Bielenstein, op cit., II, 392 and 402, "biežidzīt" (to
drive, chase, often)
jadināt, ibid. I, 425 : L jodinėti (to take a ride, ride about on
horseback); LAVTur also gives jādelēt (to ride about);
jadināt and jādelēt: jā (to ride), cf. L joti.

3.223. The above list is only a selection of the iterative-intensive forms given by Endzelīns in *Latviešu Valodas Gramatika* (640, 647, 655, 659, 667). Nevertheless from these examples alone it can be seen that Latvian diverges somewhat from Lithuanian in its preference for -āt/-īt: -ināt in the function of iterative-intensive marker.

Latvian has seen a reduction in the number of possible derivational formants largely on account of the phonetic changes which occurred in the pre-literate period. L nasal diphthongs have become oral long vowels or oral diphthongs; thus Lithuanian distinguishes -yti (i:ti) and inti, whereas in Latvian both would have coalesced in -īt (-i:t). Again certain suffixes are very productive, cf. -ot, which is much more frequent than the corresponding : -uoti.

On the other hand there is no exact equivalent of the L -inėti. Though La ināt corresponds in many cases to L -inėti, and in so far as it has replaced forms in -inēt, it corresponds phonetically to inėti, -ināt has not assumed the iterative-intensive function to anything like the extent that the Lithuanian suffix has done. The suffix -ināt has retained the polysemy which it is reasonable

to suppose was characteristic of many such suffixes at an earlier stage of the language. Thus -ināt may be denominative, dibināt (to found) from dibens, bottom; it may be causative, audzināt (to educate, train, bring up); augt (to grow). Audzināt corresponds to L auginti with essentially the same range of meaning. An example of the use of audzināt from a translation of George Orwell's Animal Farm will serve to illustrate the suffix -ināt in the causative role. This example occurs on page 15: '... Snowball and Napoleon, whom Mr. Jones was breeding up for sale.' "... Sniegapika un Napoleons, kurus Džonss audzināja pārdošanai." (DZF, p 15). With reference to this suffix therefore one may conclude that the causative and denominative verbs are clearly distinguished by their meaning (cf. augt: audzināt or the denominative īsināt 'to shorten' < the adj īss, 'short'). Moreover the causative suffix fulfils a useful role in both Baltic languages as a formant of transitive verbs from intransitives, thereby aiding in the creation of new members of the transitive: intransitive opposition which is so characteristic of the Baltic verbal system.³⁴ Iterative verbs in -ināt are not so clearly defined a role as the causative forms in -ināt.

The iterative-intensive forms in -āt/-īt are more clearly

34. cf. Christian Stang, "Dagegen findet man in Balt. die Tendenz eine andere Art von Doppelverba zu schaffen, nämlich transitive und intransitive:; dies ist aber nur eine Tendenz, ein Motiv in der Sprachentwicklung. Es handelt sich nicht um ein geschlossenes System, wie bei den slav. perf.-imperf. Paarverba." Das Slavische und Baltische Verbum, p 98

defined, yet even here they are not found in great numbers and the suffixes are of low productivity. It would seem that firstly the iterative-intensive suffix has not been so highly developed as in Lithuanian and that secondly there are areas of doubt as to the iter or intens nature of the suffix in some so-called iteratives or intensives, this factor being particularly marked in the case of vbs in -ināt.

3.224. In view of the remarks expressed above (3.223) the Latvian iterative-intensive forms are not adequately marked for these qualities (i.e. iterativeness or intensiveness) or are in insufficient numbers to favour their use in the functional role of aspectual determinants. The existence of iteratives or intensives in the role of aspect marker in Lithuanian has not exerted any influence on Latvian usage despite the fact that the two countries are both geographically contiguous and closely related. In fact, in the grammatical developments (as opposed to the lexical) there is a marked difference between features inherited and those which have developed since the two languages separated. It has not been a case of one language developing and of one standing still (and one would have expected the relatively more archaic Lithuanian to have developed least), but rather of both languages developing along different lines.

Lithuanian is extremely rich in derivational suffixes which have retained their distinctiveness. Latvian on the other hand has fewer suffixes of this kind and, moreover, with its loss of flexions has tended to rely on analytical means. To take an example from the substantival declension, prescriptive grammar has provided Latvian with an instrumental case which serves to bring it into line with East Baltic norms and E and W Slavic norms. Thus,

La ar vīru (by the man) corresponds to L vyru and to Pol człowiekiem and R želovekom. However, the form vīru (I) is identical with the form vīru (A); in the plural paradigm the Dat and the Inst are the same. In diachronic terms the -u is a contraction of -o, which is the normal reflex of -a-n and which corresponds to L vyr̃.³⁵ The distinguishing feature in this case is not the suffix -u but the preposition ar which always accompanies the case. The use of discrete lexical elements is also found within the La verbal system. The conditional suffix -tu is attached to the infinitive stem of the verb and remains invariable, while the Lithuanian cognate -ty is 3P only. A new set of personal endings has been evolved by Lithuanian and in this sense it is an innovator when compared to Latvian. The original form in both the Lithuanian and the Latvian paradigm is the 3P and this is the only form which has remained the same both in diachronic and synchronic terms, i.e. the earliest Lithuanian texts show -ty (or -tu), though they exhibit a wide range of divergence in the other persons of the paradigm.³⁶ The modern literary language has 1P sg -čiau, but in Žemaičiai for instance we find -čio, while S and E Lithuanian dialects have -tau (see further ChSt p 249). That the 3P should be the same everywhere is not surprising since this form has remained unmarked for number throughout the whole Baltic language area. The diversity of the suffixes marking person and

35. The suffix -a-n posited for the accusative sing of masc ~~o~~-stems in both proto-Lithuanian and proto-Latvian might equally well have been written -a-m.

36. cf. 2P sg: Daukša -tumbei; Mažvydas -tumbi; Širvydas -tumey.

the total absence of person markers in Latvian suggests that the personal endings of Lithuanian arose after the separation of Lithuanian and Latvian from common E Baltic.

Arising out of the use of the personal pronouns with the 3P³⁷ to mark number is the extension of this usage to other persons in all tenses, though the person may be adequately marked by the verb ending. In the Latvian conditional where the verb form marks only tense this use of the personal pronouns became a permanent feature of the paradigm:

- | | |
|------|--------------------------------|
| i.e. | 1. es būtu (I should be) |
| | 2. tu būtu (you would be) |
| | 3. viņš būtu (he would be etc) |
| | 1. mēs būtu |
| | 2. jūs būtu |
| | 3. viņi būtu |

The personal endings of the relative mood (atstāstījuma IE -o-m, but this form had in any case been reduced to a nasal vowel in the earliest E Baltic written records. izteiksme) are formed in the same way with the aid of the personal pronouns since the forms in -ot are invariable (-ot was originally the adverbial or indecl form of a participle).³⁸ The present of the relative mood of augt (grow) is

37. of 3P of vb 'to be': L sg: jis, ji yra (esti): pl: jie yra.

38. The forms in -ot are to be regarded as tense in the same way that būtu is a tense, or the R form pisal is a tense. Stang (ShSt p 243) lays too much stress on the nominal (participial) origin of the form, whereas in modern literary Latvian these forms function as finite verbs and should be considered such. The forms in -ot correspond to Lithuanian indecl participles in -ant.

as follows: es, tu, viņš augot. mēs, jūs, viņi augot. Apart from the future augot the other tenses of this mood are formed with the aid of the verb 'to be' (esot, būst) and the past active participle in -is.

This use of discrete lexical elements is paralleled in E Slavic where the l-participle is now a tense form since it has lost its auxiliary verb. The E Slavic past tense is characterised by the unusual feature that it marks gender and number but not person. Polish has on the other hand recreated a secondary system of endings which indicate person,³⁹ and these are added onto the l-participle with truncation of the vowel of the suffix in certain cases.⁴⁰ Lithuanian like Polish has developed a secondary series of suffixes for the conditional and this development conforms with the Lithuanian norms. Latvian practice on the other hand shows a tendency towards the use of analytical structures. By analytical structures is meant the use of separate words to render syntactical and morphological relationships. Thus Latvian as we have seen uses prepositions to render case/casual relationships and

39. The Pol personal endings are: -em, -eś, -śmy, -ście. These are in diachronic terms relics of the verb (to be, which was in Old Pol: jeśm, jeś, jeśmy, jeście; the 3P forms do not appear in this tense since the participle is sufficient to express this person.

40. Truncation takes place in the sg when the -e- of the personal endings -em, -eś is dropped after the -a of the feminine participle: i.e. pisała-ś.

personal pronouns to indicate person in the subject. It may be argued that this usage has been dictated by the need to obviate ambiguity. Nevertheless as Lithuanian has shown there is more than one method of avoiding ambiguity and Latvian usage shows a definite preference for the analytical method.

When we come to consider the derivation of imperfective verbs we shall see that Latvian has adopted a similar procedure to that adopted above to express the relationships of person and case. Indeed the creation of imperfective forms for compound perfective verbs has been called ~~the~~ 'analytical construction'. In our analysis of this process we shall have to consider what form the process takes, what restrictions limit the full application of the process, and lastly we shall suggest why this process was adopted in preference to the methods used by neighbouring language groups, and in particular Lithuanian.

3.30. The Analytical Construction.

3.31. If one analyses the following Latvian compound verbs, atvērt (open), aizvērt (shut), iziet (go out), and nolēkt (jump down), one finds that they all consist of three components: prefix root (none of these verbs is derived so one may exclude for the moment all derivational suffixes) and finally the infinitive marker -t. It is, however, the prefix which distinguishes any

of the above verbs from the corresponding simple verb *vērt*, which is not frequently found in this meaning (i.e. to open or shut, since theoretically it may have either meaning). That this is no real difficulty will become clear later. No such complication arises with *iet* (go) and *lēkt* (jump); these differ from the compound forms in that movement of a certain type is implied, but no specific direction is inferred for that movement. The prefix in these cases adds the idea of direction of the movement (outward or downward) or in the case of the verbs meaning 'to shut' or 'to open' it points to two different types of action. At the same time the prefixes function grammatically, as aspect markers. They mark these verbs as perfective. Yet these vb forms differ from a form such as *padarīt* (do) where the *pa-* is de-semanticised and marks merely perfectivity. In the case of *padarīt* the omission of the prefix makes the verb imperfective; *darīt*. If one omitted the prefix from the vbs *atvērt*, *aizvērt*, *iziet* or *nolēkt*, the forms thus obtained would be imperfective but they would also differ lexically from the compound verbs. The use of the analytical construction allows one to retain the lexical value of the prefix while the vb reverts to the simple form. In other words one substitutes for the prefix a free form which has the same meaning. Thus for *atvērt* one would obtain *vērt valā*, where *valā* corresponds to the prefix *at-*; similarly *aizvērt* corresponds to *vērt ciet*, *iziet*: *iet ārā* (or *laukā*) and *nolēkt*: *lēkt zemē*.⁴¹

41. The forms *atvērt*, *aizvērt* may be replaced by *attaisīt*, *aiztaisīt* without change of meaning; the form *taisīt* 'do' can be used in the analytical construction as can the compounds of *vērt*, cf. 'Taisi durvis ciet'. 'Shut the door' from Turkina. The forms *attaisīt*, *aiztaisīt* are strongly reminiscent of the German vbs *aufmachen*, *zumachen*.

3.320 An analysis of the markers of the analytical construction.

3.321 The grammatical status of the free forms *vaļā*, *ārā*/*laukā*, *ciet* and *zemē* is not difficult to ascertain; they are all adverbs, though *ciet* or *cieti* is the only one derived from an adjective (*ciets* - firm). *Ārs* (outside), *lauks* (field) and *zeme* (earth, land) are all nouns in the locative case. The suffix *-ā*, (*-ā*, *-ī*) here referred to as locative also functions as an allative or illative; thus '*viņš gāja ārā*' shows *ārā* functioning as an allative, whereas '*ārā gulēja suņi*' shows *ārā* functioning as a locative, since 'he went out' implies movement outwards. In the second example, however, 'the dogs were lying outside' implies state not movement.

3.322. There are a large number of such adverbs and theoretically at least it would be possible to substitute an adverb for any prefix. Moreover, since every prefix has more than one meaning, the meaning 'down' may correspond to more than one adverb: *zemē* where the movement is more abrupt or in the spatial sense closer to the vertical, *lēkt/zemē*, or where the descent is more gradual, *lejā/leju*,⁴²

42. The adverbs *lejā* and *leju* in allative contexts are interchangeable; *leju* with its suffix *-p* (also found in *šurp*, *turp* (here, there)) is purely allative.

as in the example from Jānis Jaunsudrabiņš: 'No sētsvidus gāja zaļains celis lejup,... JJBgr p 14, (The grass path ran down from the courtyard,..). Similarly in the sentence 'He ran down to the gate,...' the following translations were obtained: 'Vipš noskrēja lejā pie vārtiem,.. (La 3); 'Vipš skrēja lejā uz vārtiem... (La 2). The other two versions differed from the above: one did not stress the downward movement at all (Vipš skrēja uz vārtiem.. La 1) while the other translated 'he ran as far as the gate.. (Vipš aizskrēja līdz vārtiem,, La 5). Two informants (La 3 and La 5) have provided perfective versions noskrēja and aizskrēja, and the first of these has further emphasised the downward movement implicit in the prefix by combining it with the adv lejā. The combination of a perfective verb and an adv corresponding to the prefix is, as we shall find, not uncommon. The adverb has in such instances no grammatical significance but merely serves to give additional emphasis.

The basic meaning of the prefix no- is 'away from' and the corresponding adv will be nost. As examples of this concrete spatial meaning may be cited: noņemt, nogrūst, noplēst 'to take away, shove off, to tear off); all have corresponding analytical forms with nost. Nost is the adverb when the prefix no- has the more abstract meaning of death or impairment (see 3.21.): cf. noslāpt (to suffocate). V Staltmane cites two examples of this verb in the perfective and imperfective respectively: (p) '(Aža) Neļaužu gailam noslāpt'. (RBILi 70) "I will not allow the cock to suffocate." and (i), 'Pašreiz es slapstu nost' (AGrļie 26) "At present I just suffocate."

Also with the meaning 'away from' is the prefix at-, though

this is only one of its many meanings. In this meaning at- is replaced by several adverbs: nost (away from), prom or projām (away, off); thus atņemt (p) 'to take away': ņemt nost; atgāņāt (p) 'to keep away, drive away': gāņāt prom (i). The prefix at- may be attached to verbs of physical activity where movement in a specific direction is not implied. A verb of this type is 'atvērt' (to open) and here, as we have seen (3.34.) the corresponding adv is vaļā: i.e. atvērt (p): vērt vaļā. Where the meaning of at- is 'back' the corresponding adv is either atpakaļ (back, backwards) or pretī (opposite). The verb atrauties (to draw, start back) has an imperfective form rauties atpakaļ.

There is a not inconsiderable number of compound verbs where the meaning is 'to approach, come nearer', equivalents of which may also be found in Lithuanian with this prefix.⁴³ Such a verb is atsteigties (to come hurrying) and the aspectual opposition of this verb and its imperfective counterpart is clearly illustrated in the following two examples cited by V. Staltmane: '... Tracis auga arvien lielāks līdz kamēr atsteidzās pristava palīgs ar... gardavājiem.' (AUP 1m 579) p: "The turmoil grew greater and greater until the local police inspector hurried up with... some constables". And in a descriptive passage: 'Pārī mežam aiz purva steidzās šurpu rīta gaissma' (EBU Izl 41)⁴⁴ i: "The morning light used to hurry

43. Cf. the following Lithuanian vbs in at-: ateiti (come, arrive); atvesti (bring); atvežti (carry, bring) etc. The corresponding Latvian verbs do not necessarily have imperfective constructions with šurp

44. References here to original source in Staltmane's article and not to pages in article.

here across the woods beyond the moor".

3.323. The above analysis of the analytical construction is only intended to be an outline. Many more correspondences could be cited. What is basic to the Latvian aspectual system is the substitution of an adverb for the prefix of a compound perfective verb. This adverb is identical in meaning with the prefix. As a result the pair of verbs thus formed differ grammatically, they belong to different aspects. For instance iet iekša 'to enter' (i) can be substituted for ieiet (p), and kāpt pāri 'to step over, to cross' (i) for pārkāpt (p).

In theory a form in the analytical construction could be established for any compound perfective verb, since the means for creating such forms exists and is productive. We shall find, however, that there are various restrictions placed on the use of this construction and we must now consider what these restrictions are.

3.330. Restrictions on the use of the analytical construction.

3.331. In the modern language vbs which are found in the analytical construction may omit the adverb where its insertion would lead to repetitiveness. In the following example (cited by V. Staltmane) we have three instances of the verb uzvilkt (here in the meaning of 'to put on'): 'Olga...., paķērusi virsjaku, vilka to virsu neverēdama iedabūt roku piedurknē. Juris ievēroja, ka viņa velk otrādi - ar padrēbi uz augšu... Viņš paņēma jaku un palīdzēja uzvilkt. ASPk 17' "Olga..., seized her jacket and put it on but

without being able to get her arm into the sleeve. Juris noticed that she was putting it on inside out - with the lining uppermost He took the jacket and helped her on with it". In the first instance the form vilka ... virsu is in the analytical construction, with virsu replacing the prefix uz-; she is still in the process of putting the jacket on but without success. The form velk is also imperfective since it is the manner in which the jacket is being put on that is being emphasised and not the completion of the process. In the third and final instance the action is successfully completed and we have the prefixed form uzvilkt. It would be possible to add virsu to the word velk but this is unnecessary since the context is clearly imperfective and it is also clear from the same context that we are concerned with uzvilkt 'to put on' and not merely the simple verb vilkt 'draw'.

3.332. A prefixed verb may already be constructed with an adverb and the whole phrase has the idea of overcoming an obstacle. Verbs with the prefix iz- and the adverb cauri (the adverbial form of the preposition caur 'through, across') are limited in this way. An example of this usage is the phrase 'iziet cauri mežam (of. R projti skvoz'les). If one were to use the construction caur mežu this would be a neutral statement whereas the use of cauri implies effort needed to overcome an obstacle. The imperfective form of this phrase excludes the analytical construction; consequently we have the aspectual opposition: iziet cauri mežam (p) 'to cross the wood' iet cauri mežam (i). The imperfective might best be translated 'to go across the wood'; as with the perfective the effort needed to overcome this obstacle is present though the successful outcome

is not envisaged. Similarly the prefix pa- has no suppletive form in the analytical construction: cf. palīst zem gultas, galda (to crawl under the bed, under the table) where the imperfective is līst zem gultas, zem galda.

3.333. There are cases where the verbs in its prefixed form is unrelated to its simple form. For instance apcietināt 'to arrest' is only connected in the most tenuous way to the simple verb cietināt 'to harden' and here the prefixed form also functions as an imperfective. Also bi-aspectual are: atriet 'to avenge' 'retaliate' which has a simple form riekt, meaning 'to be repulsive' and nokļūt 'to arrive, turn up' where the simple form klūt means 'to become'.

3.334. The difference between the prefixed form and the simple form of the verb may not be as great as in the above examples: cf. uzskatīt 'to consider' and skatīt 'to look'. Again there are verbs where the simple form has either been lost or is very rarely used. Examples of the first type are the prefixed verbs atzīt 'to recognise (some quality in someone)', cf. R priznat'; pazīt 'to recognise', cf. R uznat'. There is in Latvian no vb*zīt corresponding to the R znat'. Corresponding to R znat' we find zināt (cognate with L žinoti) which differs from the compound verbs in that it has acquired a derivational suffix -ā-. The radical of all three vbs (zināt, atzīt, pazīt) is the morpheme zin-. As an example of the second type Staltmane puts forward the verb palīdzēt 'to help'. This is certainly not the case; Turkina gives three examples of the simple verb, līdzēt: 'zāles labi ne līdz' 'What is the use of

it?"; 'tas neko nelīdz' "It's of no use/avail". In certain contexts therefore līdzēt is still productive. The form palīdzēt also occurs in these contexts: cf. 'zāles man palīdzēja.' "The medicine relieved me". This is a normal perfective context and contrasts with 'zāles labi līdz' above. As an auxiliary used in conjunction with an infinitive one would normally find palīdzēt: palīdzēt kādam nokāpt' "to help somebody down" or palīdzēt kādam uzvilkt mēteļi' "to help somebody on with his (or her) overcoat."

3.335. Perhaps the largest class of bi-aspectual vbs consists of verbs where the separate morphemes making up the verb i.e. prefix, root and derivational stems, have lost their original meaning and acquired a more abstract one. Such a vb is izdot 'to publish, issue'. It is likely that such forms as izdot are calques from Slavic, in this case Russian izdat, on chronological grounds. Many such verbs are to be found within the abstract and technical registers: cf. pārbaudīt 'to check' (the simple vb baudīt means 'to enjoy'); iepazīties 'to investigate'; pārredzēt 'to overlook'; pierādīt 'to prove'. The prefix pār- attached to some of the verbs in this group points to an action being performed a second time: cf. pārrakstīt 'to copy' (from radstīt 'to write'); pārzīmēt 'to redesign'; pārbūvēt 'to rebuild'; pārsūt 'to re-sow'; pārrēķināt 'to recalculate'.

While this class of vbs is characterised by the fact that it cannot form imperfectives by means of the analytical construction, this does not exclude the use of adverbs in the emphatic role, but which do not bring about a change of aspect: cf. the use of nopt in the following example from Rudolfs Blaumanis, cited by

V. Staltmane: '... Viņš aizvilka Jāni nost no citiem un spieda tam rokā pusriecienu rupjas maizes (RBI Nov 164).' "He drew John away from the others and pressed into his hand a half slice of coarse bread". Despite the presence of nost aizvilka remains perfective.

3.340. Anomalies in the use of the analytical construction.

3.341. There are perfective verbs where the range of meaning of the prefix and the verb overlap. The verb kaut 'to kill', 'slaughter' forms its perfective with the aid of the prefix no- which as we have seen (3.21 and 3.322) contains within itself the notion of death and impairment (cf. its use with mirt 'to die'). Without the prefix the verb kaut corresponds to the following verbs with related meanings: nogalināt 'to kill, murder, slay'; nonāvēt 'to kill, murder'. The prefix no- does not bring to the vb kaut any new lexical meaning. Nokaut is, however, closely related to such verbs as nosist 'to kill'; nomaitāt 'to kill, exterminate', nokast 'to bite to death' where the meaning of killing is derived from the prefix alone and which consequently require the analytical construction. As a result of the analogy with these verbs we have the forms: kaut nost; sist nost; maitāt nost; kost nost. Such analogous forms occur with verbs where the range of meaning of the prefix and the vb overlaps or does not differ substantially.

3.342. A similar case is that of the vb lasīt; the simple verb means 'to gather' while the prefix sa- of the perfective form salasīt conveys the idea of 'bringing things or people together'.

Cf. '... Velns lasījis, lasījis bet līdz ar gaiļiem visu birumu nespējis salasīt.' AGr 11e 25 (quoted by V. Staltmane, page 23). "The devil gathered them up and gathered them up until cock-crow, but he couldn't collect all that were astray". In this example the contrast is made between *salasīt* and *lasījis*, and the imperfective form is the simple verb. However, in the following example (also from Staltmane, (p 23) the imperfective aspect is marked by the use of the analytical construction, though this is in fact redundant since the relationship of *sa-* to *lasīt* is a purely formal one, i.e. does not add any new meaning to the verb. The quotation is from Stasti of Birznieks-Upītis: 'Mate lasīja kopā sīkas stikla drumstalas un mums parmēta ... EBUST 8' "Mother gathered together the small bits of broken glass and reproached us ..." Here the adverb appropriate to the analytical construction is used. The forms kaut nost and lasīja kapā can only be considered pleonasms. Two possible suggestions as to why these forms are used have been put forward by Staltmane (pp23-24): firstly the use of the analytical construction may have arisen through analogy with forms where the prefix was not a formal one, i.e. where an additional nuance of meaning derived from the prefix: for instance, the simple verbs *sist* and *maitāt* mean 'to beat' and 'to damage', the compound vbs could then be rendered 'to beat to death' and 'to damage fatally'. Alternatively this usage may have arisen through a desire to give to the imperfective form expressive colouring which would be absent from the original simple form. Neither explanation need exclude the other, in fact such a usage would be more likely to develop should the stimulus for change have more than one cause.

3.350. The origins of the analytical construction.

3.351. It is the use of adverbial elements such as nost with the verb kaut where they are redundant that may explain the rise of the analytical construction as a marker of the imperfective aspect of compound verbs. In the first place kaut is not a compound verb, it only becomes one on being perfectivised with the aid of the prefix no-. Since kaut means 'to kill' and nost contains the same idea kaut nost can only show added emphasis; the idea of 'killing' has become more intensive. In other words it stresses the action rather than the completion of the action. In the compound vb on the other hand the prefix no- does point to the completion of the action, though the selection of no- as the marker of the perfective may have depended to a certain extent on the fact that they share the same content, which may also be said of kaut and nost. Nevertheless in the compound form no- kaut the ideational content has been neutralised in favour of the grammatical role which the prefix has to play.

3.352. We are faced with a totally different situation when the prefix no- is used with such verbs as sist 'to beat' or maitāt 'to damage'; here it is only in conjunction with no- or nost that these verbs contain the idea of 'killing'. In fact it might even be said that with the verbs nosist and nomaitāt the idea of 'killing' contained in the prefix has neutralised the original meanings inherent in the simple verbs sist and maitāt.

3.353. The imperfective forms of nosist and nomaitāt conforms to

the rules of the analytical construction where in the case of *nokaut* and *salasīt* there is a fluctuation between the simple verbs *kaut* and *lasīt* and the new pleonastic analytical forms *kaut nost* and *lasīt kopā*. The very existence of this fluctuation tends to suggest that the use of adverbial elements to replace prefixes is a fairly recent one, i.e. in the role of aspect markers. Since adverbs are found in conjunction with prefixed verbs without any change of aspect taking place, it is not the combination of verb and adverb that is recent but rather the use of this construction to mark aspect. In fact the combination of verb and adverb is as characteristic feature both of modern literary Latvian, also of Latvian folk-lore. Folk-lore studies have revealed the existence of what have been called *polyptota*, i.e. adverbs derived from verbs which are used in conjunction with the verb from which they are derived. An example of such a polyptoton is the adverb *lēkšus* translated by Turkina as 'at a gallop'. It has been found, however, in conjunction with the verb *lēkt* 'to jump', *lēkšus lēkt* intensifying the idea of 'jumping'. The form *lēkšus* (and the verb *lēkšot* to which it is directly related) are derived ultimately from *lēkt*, and the association of the two forms recalls the association of *kaut* and *nost* in that both constructions imply an intensification of the verbal action.

3.3531. Here one may also mention other stylistic modes which are used to emphasise certain sub-categories of the imperfective. Perhaps the commonest of these is reduplication which is, moreover, not confined to Latvian or even to Baltic. A Latvian example of the durative use of reduplication is cited by Erich Hofmann in

his study 'Ausdrucksverstärkung'⁴⁵ 'iet, iet, kamēr saiet majiņu'⁴⁶ which he translated "ging, ging, bis er das Häuschen erreichte". And a similar example in Lithuanian: 'grajino, grajino ir prasi-grajino savo drabužius.'⁴⁷ In both examples the reduplication of the simple verb iet or grajino serves to underline the duration of the action of these verbs, while the perfective verb in the second half of the utterances points to the eventual result of these actions. Hofmann in this study gives many more examples of this type of usage both in durative contexts and iterative contexts. One feels, however, that such modes of expression may be adequate to stress the imperfectivity of simple verbs which are already imperfective; they cannot, however, serve as markers of aspect. The same criticism may be levelled at the polyptota mentioned above (3.353.). In this respect the only construction which can be said to have achieved the status of a system remains the analytical construction.

3.40. A comparison of the Lithuanian and Latvian aspect systems.

45. Ausdrucksverstärkung, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, Ergänzungshefte, 7-10, p 27.

46. Anss Lerchis-Puschkaitis: Latweeschu tautas teikas un pasakas, I-VII, Jelgawa, p 17.

47. LitauischeVolkslieder und Märchen... gesammelt A. Leskien and K. Brugman, Strassburg, 1882 181, 33.

3.41. In the last two chapters we have examined the aspect system of both Lithuanian and Latvian. Both systems show a similarity in the distribution of verbs within the aspectual system and at the same time they differ in the formants they use to make the distinction.

3.42. A characteristic feature of both Baltic languages and a feature in which they differ from Slavic is the existence of a large class of bi-aspectual vbs. Bi-aspectual vbs in themselves are not in themselves an unusual feature of any language which possesses the aspect distinction; what is unusual is the large size of this class in Baltic and the range of meaning which it covers. As one might expect it contains certain vbs which are also to be found in Slavic with this characteristic.

3.421. For instance it would be surprising if statal vbs were not to show this characteristic since no movement or transition from one state to another is implied. Thus La *sēdēt*, L *sēdēti* and R *sidet'* all mean 'to be sitting' and will most frequently be found in the simple form. Prefixation and hence perfectivisation points to short duration of the act of 'sitting'. The utterance 'He sat for a short time' is translated: La '*Viņš pasēdēja drusku*'; L '*Jis pasēdējo trumpatēji*'; R '*On posidel nemnogo*'.

3.422. Another group of bi-aspectual verbs is that of verbs of perception. This is logical since the act of perceiving infers duration and the absence of the prefix will tend to underline this fact. Where the time elapsed is very short or approximated to a

point, we are concerned with an Aktionsart of the act of perceiving, yet one that will naturally belong to the perfective aspect. In these circumstances in Baltic as in Slavic a prefix will be attached to the verb, cf. R videt' 'to see': uvidet' 'to catch sight of'; La redzēt: paredzēt; L matyti: pamatyti. The parallelism is not, however, quite exact; R uvidet' is more restricted than pamatyti or paredzēt.

3.423. The Baltic languages are also in agreement on another group of bi-aspectual verbs, and here the comparison with Slavic breaks down. This group is prefixed and the distinguishing feature is the fact that the simple verb which would normally correspond to these prefixed forms is either not found or rare, or it may have a totally different meaning. Such is L vykti 'to go, betake oneself' compared to atvykti 'to arrive, to come'. Though vykti with the meanings given above is found in the dictionary (LAZ60) it is far from common according to a Lithuanian speaking informant. In Latvian the verb nokļūt 'to arrive' is totally unrelated to kļūt 'to become', often used as a passive auxiliary. Many such verbs in Lithuanian may be imperfectivised with the aid of the suffix -inėti. In Latvian, however, the analytical construction is excluded with verbs of this group. It would not be possible to substitute kļūt nost for nokļūt. To the Lithuanian speaker also the form atvykdinėti is essentially characterised as iterative. The imperfective of atvykti would thus consist of two possible forms: atvykti where iterativeness is not particularly stressed and atvykdinėti where iterativeness is the main consideration.

3.424. Another group of verbs which is more often found in the simple form are vbs of speaking: cf. L *sakyti*, *tarti* and La *sacīt*, *teikt*. This use of the non-prefixed forms in both imperfective and perfective contexts is a characteristic feature of these verbs when they serve to introduce another utterance, whether in indirect or direct speech: cf the following Latvian examples: La 'In tad cilvēks ierunājās Viņš teica: Es aizēju. 'Lie, 4, 69, p 20): "And then the man began to speak. He said: 'I am going away'". The context here is perfective, while in the next utterance the context is imperfective: 'Martha iznāk laukumā. - Ko jūs teicāt, šef?' (Lie, 3, 69, p 28): "Martha came out onto the square. - What did you say Chief?". The perfective form of this verb, pateikt is used when what is being said is defined more exactly: cf. 'To es nevaru pateikt' (Lie, 3, 69, p28): "I cannot tell you that". The word that delimits the act of telling. The Lithuanian usage in this respect has already been discussed above (Chap. 2).

Compound verbs of 'saying' share this bi-aspectualism. The verbs 'to answer' *atsacīt* (also 'to refuse'), *atbildēt*, 'to add', 'to remark', 'piebilst' are always found in the compound form: the analytical form is excluded. This usage recalls that of other compound abstract verbs, but diverges from Lithuanian usage. The L vb atsakyti is, it is true, more often found in this form, but the imperfective atsakinėti is not excluded.

3.425. Certain Lithuanian verbs which L Dambriūnas claimed were perfective only, (he allocated them to the category of point action verbs) must in many cases be considered bi-aspectual, but with a definite preference for the perfective aspect. A vb of this type

is rasti. 'to find, discover'. In sentence 'Tā tiltā jie rado,...' (ALLL p3) it is clear that the action is of extremely short duration, the three deserters are walking through the forest when they suddenly come upon the bridge. It is comparable, in fact, to the form pamatē in the sentence: Jis pamatē ja skymirkšniui traukinio lange' (L 1) "He caught sight of her momentarily at the train window." Hence the feature of short duration is inherent in the basic verb and this will account for the frequency of the simple vb rasti in perfective contexts. Yet the form atrasti does exist with the meaning of 'to find again, to find out (the truth)'; the difference between the simple form and the compound atrasti is not very great. In Latvian, however, the simple verb rast is not bi-aspectual or even a point action verb, but is in contrastive opposition with atrast. Since the action of 'finding, coming upon' is normally a sudden action or one of short duration one finds atrast more frequently than corresponding simple form, i.e. in the meaning of 'to find'. The simple verb rast also means 'to become accustomed' as in the example, 'Viņš ir radis agri celties': "He is accustomed to getting up early". The reflexive form rasties has the meaning of 'to arise', 'spring up (unexpectedly)'. Conversely atrasties of which the basic meaning is 'to be found', 'to be' (cf R nahodit'sja, Fr se trouver etc.,) has a secondary meaning of 'to turn up' (something which has been lost). The first meaning is also shared by L atsirasti.

3.426. Latvian and Lithuanian usage is in general agreement in preferring the simple form or a bi-aspectual compound form for auxiliary verbs such as L galēti, La varēt 'to be able' and L imti,

pradėti La sākt 'to begin, etc. When used as auxiliary vbs these forms are neutral with regard to aspect. Thus one may use L pradėti or imti followed by an infinitive in both imperfective or perfective contexts. The fact that pradėti is prefixed does not preclude its appearance in imperfective contexts any more than the fact that imti is in the simple form precludes its use in perfective contexts. The La vb sākt again shows preference for the simple form: in a list of eleven examples sākt is to iesākt in a proportion of 8 : 3. A questionnaire which was sent out to four Lithuanian, five Latvian and two Bulgarian informants contained the following sentence: "It has started", the people shouted when the earth began to tremble.' Here started and began show the verb functioning in both the non-auxiliary and the auxiliary role. The form 'started' was translated into Lithuanian in all cases by prasidėjo whereas 'began' appeared once as ėmė and three times as pradėjo. For 'started' the Latvian versions had: sākās (twice) ir sācies (twice) and sācies (once); 'began' was in all cases sāka. The two Bulgarian informants used the perfective form započna in all cases.

Latvian also possesses the perfective form uzsākt (in addition to iesākt) and this is not found in the auxiliary role. It is found in such locutions as uzsākt saraktīšanos 'to enter into correspondence', uzsākt kara darbību 'to open hostilities', uzsākt dziesmu 'begin (to strike up) a song', and uzsākt strīdu 'to raise (pick) a quarrel'. It is possible to regard this form as a separate lexeme or as an Aktionsart. In all the above mentioned examples we are concerned with the moment when an action commences. The act of 'beginning' is not characterised by duration. There is

an obvious link here with these inceptive verbs which are marked by a prefix rather than the use of an auxiliary.

The main characteristic of a verb functioning as an auxiliary is the fact of its dependence. It is not a totally free form but is always found in conjunction with another verb (usually in the infinitive or a suppletive of the infinitive). It is possibly from the fact that it is dependent on another verb that the auxiliary verb has passed into the bi-aspectual class.

3.50. The aspectual system in Baltic.

3.51. Though it can be established without difficulty that an aspectual system exists in Baltic comparable to the Slavic system, certain features stand out as being peculiar to Baltic. The first and most noteworthy is the existence of a large class of bi-aspectual verbs. This class includes not only simple vbs which by their nature show a preference for one aspect, i.e. statal verbs, but also prefixed verbs which have no simple or imperfectivised forms.

3.52. The importance of the restrictions which speakers of these languages impose on the use of markers of imperfectivisation is central to our understanding of this problem. These restrictions would seem - at least in part - to be based on the retention of the original meaning of these markers. For instance the L imperfective formant -inėti is still felt as iterative or intensive. A verb such as atvykti 'to come, arrive' appears unchanged in imperfective contexts which do not stress either of these values.

There exists the form atvykdinėti which stresses the iterative value of this suffix. Thus the aspectual pattern of this verb is: atvykti (p): atvykti (i) and atvykdinėti (i and iter). Hence the Baltic languages show an incomplete aspectual system. It is this lack of polarity which is characteristic and which tends to suggest that these languages show an intermediate stage between the existence of aspectual features side by side with a tense system which stresses anteriority and non-anteriority and the Slavic system where aspect is hierarchically superior to tense.

3.53. The next problem which must be considered is the existence of certain tense forms which in themselves convey differences of aspect. Such tense forms are, of course, also to be found outside Slavic and Baltic, but there they form separate elements within a tense system; they do not interact with an aspectual category which subsumes within it an entire verbal paradigm. The tenses in question are the aorist and the imperfect and they are to be the subject of the following chapter.

4.0. The aorist and the imperfect tenses.

4.10. The time has come to define more fully the terms aorist and imperfect. In the first instance the terms refer in all circumstances to those tenses which are so named in all those modern Slavic languages which still possess simple past tenses. Secondly these terms will include tenses corresponding to the Slavic forms in Baltic, though throughout the text the Baltic names for these tenses will be used. Thus the Slavic imperfect is compared with the Lithuanian frequentative past or the frequentative forms in Latvian. Since the range of these tenses is not always directly comparable a Baltic preterite may on occasion be compared with a Slavic imperfect.

4.11. Both the aorist and the imperfect in Slavic are past tenses and in this sense they both form contrastive oppositions with the present which is non-past. Again a contrast exists between them in so far as an utterance containing an aorist refers to a specific point in time; the imperfect is not so marked, but is dependent in this respect on the aorist. An action in the imperfect can be considered to be taking place at the same time as an action in the aorist. The imperfect shares with the present the notion of duration. Both aorist and imperfect tense may be used to describe repeated actions; the imperfect stresses here the repetitive or habitual nature of the action whereas the aorist points to a series of short term actions envisaged as one whole. In this respect the time elapsed between each action is important; when the aorist is used it will be very short. If, for instance,

one were shearing sheep and one sheared one sheep after the other the verb form would be aorist, since each action is short and is completed before the next one is commenced. Moreover the whole series of actions is regarded as being completed. The lapse of time between repeated actions in the imperfect can be much longer. For instance one could say of a farmer that he went to market every Thursday. Here a full week has elapsed between each visit and what is more important the series of visits is not regarded as closed. It will be seen that many of these notions are shared by the corresponding Baltic forms and the comparison between the two language groups will be studied in greater detail in the next chapter.

4.12. Reference was made to those Slavic languages which still possess simple past tenses (4.10.) and it is a fact that the number of languages which still possess these tenses as living forms is now quite small. With the exception of splinter groups (such as Upper Lusatian) the aorist and imperfect has been eliminated totally from the East and West Slavic groups. The simple tenses in these groups have been replaced by the compound tenses: these are compound tenses, of course, only in diachronic terms since East Slavic has lost the auxiliary completely, while in West Slavic only Czech retains the auxiliary; in Polish the auxiliary has been reduced to a set of personal endings which resemble other clitics in that they are semi-free morphemes (they may be attached to other parts of speech).

In the South Slavic area Slovene and SCr largely resemble Czech in that they retain the auxiliary. Serbo-Croat retains the

aorist and imperfect as part of the verbal paradigm, but they are less and less used, being replaced as elsewhere by the compound perfect tense. In fact it is only in Bulgarian and Macedonian that we find these two simple tenses as living forms. Henceforth our examples will be drawn from this source.

4.13. Several factors have played a part in the disappearance of the simple past tenses from the greater part of the Slavic area. Perhaps the most important factor is phonological change.

Phonological changes have affected all parts of the verbal paradigm, but the most significant from our point of view are those changes which have affected the simple past tenses. The distinctiveness of these two tenses stemmed from the fact that they possessed a) different stems and b) different sets of personal endings. Even in the OCS period, however, they shared certain endings (-xŭ of the 1P sg, 1P pl -mŭ, I, 2, 3P du -vě, -ta, -te, and the 2P pl -te) and it was a difference of both stem and ending combined which distinguished imperfect from aorist. In theoretical terms even if the endings of both paradigms were identical the thematic differences would be sufficient to keep the two paradigms apart. The imperfect has the same stem as the present while the aorist has a non-present stem. This is apparent in the 3P sg of the B verb piša to write. pres: piše/imperfect piše-še: aor pisa. The Bulgarian example cited shows a present stem piše in contrastive opposition with the non-present stem pisa: both aor and present show a zero suffix. The fusion of stems resulting from contraction led to decrease in the number of distinctive features until with many modern Bulgarian verbs the distinctive feature of the imperfect

remains the formant -še of the 2/3P sg.

The phonological changes which affected the aor and imp so strongly were accompanied by an increasing use of the perfect (a compound tense) to replace the aorist. The perfect had the supreme advantage that it was very different in form from the imperfect. The ultimate replacement of the imperfect by the same compound past tense must in some way have been favoured by the close association between the concepts of imperfective and perfective. A close association had always existed between tense and aspect, and it is maintained that at least in the minds of the speakers of those Slav languages which have lost the simple past tenses, the following relationship had arisen: aor: perfective - imperfect: ~~imperfective~~. The fluctuation between the use of a simple past tense (aor) and a compound past tense (perfect) has also been observed in Baltic. The utterance: "It has begun,"... was translated into Latvian by the preterite (twice) sākās, and three times by the perfect: Ir sācies (2 X) and Sācies. Yet all the Lithuanian informants preferred a preterite: prasidėjo. The two Bulgarian informants likewise preferred a perfective aor: започна.

It is in effect with the interaction of tense and aspect that we shall be concerned. In the first instance we shall discuss briefly in the following section the way in which this interaction is reflected in Bulgarian and Macedonian. Subsequently it is intended to discuss in greater detail the tense/aspect relationships which are to be found in the Baltic languages.

4.20. The interaction of tense and aspect in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

4.21. Bulgarian.

4.211. The relationship between tense and aspect in Bulgarian is governed by the characteristic features of the actions described. Hence, since both the imperfect tense and the imperfective aspect may express duration, in a context where duration is implied to the exclusion of other types of action the vb form would be imperfect and the aspectual category selected the imperfective: the aorist, which is not marked for duration, would be excluded. Where the action is clearly limited in time and, moreover, forms part of a sequence the imperfective aorist is used. Cf. the following example taken from the already mentioned questionnaire. 'He continued on his way and walked for two hours. In all that time he saw only two people.' The two versions submitted were in complete agreement as to the vb form and the aspect to be used: (B1) Toj prodälži päťja si i värvja 2 časa. Prez ojaloto vreme vidja samo dvama duši; (B2) Toj prodälži päťja si i värvja dva časa. Prez ojaloto tova vreme vidja samo dvama duši. The narrative sequence requires the aorist for all three verbs of the sequence. The second aorist värvja is imperfective since it is characterised by the additional nuance of time elapsed, though here clearly limited: dva časa (two hours).

4.212. The aorist is above all the narrative tense and it is in this function that it can be compared with narrative tenses in other languages. Since narration exhibits a linear scale it follows that the aorist too follows this pattern. This sequential linear pattern is a feature too of the perfective aspect and any

sequence of events will consequently be rendered by the perfective aorist unless, as on the example quoted above (4.211) other factors exist to modify this process. The imperfect on the other hand never appears in a linear sequence of this type. The example which follows shows that we must use different terminology to describe actions in the imperfect which closely follow one another. Cf. 'The shop door was constantly opening and shutting'. The two variants were: (B1) Vratata na magazina neprekásnato se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše; (B2) Vratata na magazina se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše postojanno. The actions described by the verbs otvarjaše and zatvarjaše are not to be regarded as occurring in sequence but as being part of a continuous process. This opinion is confirmed by the use of the adverbs neprekásnato (without interruption) and postojanno (constantly).

4.213. In the last example the function of the imperfect was to describe a continuous process. This process was not itself to be regarded as one of the events in the narration but as taking place at the same time as an unspecified action in the aorist. More than one imperfect action may occur side by side, cf. 'He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.' (B1) Toj tičáše nasam-natam, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova; (B2) Toj tičáše nasam-natam, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova tu s onova. In fact, since the imperfect tense does not possess the narrative function of the aorist there is no restriction on the number of imperfect actions occurring simultaneously.

4.214. The imperfect tense has as we have seen been closely

associated with the imperfective aspect. This relationship derives from the similarity of roles which this tense and aspect have assumed. Certain relationships may be briefly summarised as follows: actions looked upon as processes, durative actions, habitual actions, iterative actions where the series of repeated actions is regarded as unlimited though each action may very well be completed. The aorist too may appear in iterative contexts, but here the series of actions is regarded as one whole and forms part of a larger series.

If one takes the aorist to be the marked member in relation to the narrative sequence then the imperfect is the unmarked member of this opposition. Yet at the same time the imperfect is dependent on this narrative sequence; it provides the environment, the background to the sequence. The elimination of the opposition between the simple tenses which has taken place in East and West Slavic does not alter this basic concept. Here the perfective is the marked member and the imperfective the unmarked. The imperfective verbs in a narrative sequence are dependent on the perfective vbs. The above statement does not, of course, cover all the functional roles of tense and aspect in the modern Bulgarian literary language. It is merely intended to point to the following basic tendency: the tendency for the vast majority of imperfects to be found in imperfective contexts and for aorists to be found in perfective contexts.

4.215. The phonological reductions which have reduced the differences between the stem and suffixal morphemes which formerly separated these two tenses on the formal level may, it is believed, have

contributed to an even closer relationship between tense and aspect than would be allowed by prescriptive grammarians. This point has been noted by Howard I Aronson when he says:⁴⁸ 'At this point mention should be made of an evergrowing tendency in the development of the Bulgarian verbal system. There is a tendency to form the imperfect tense only from imperfective stems and the aorist only from perfective stems. This is especially true of verbs where the underlying form is perfective, and less true where the underlying form is a non-prefixed imperfective (not derived from an underlying perfective). This has as a result the formal differentiation of the imperfect and the aorist in those forms where in the older system they might have been homonymous. In this system truncation on the level of imperfectivization fulfils the same role as it does between the non-past and the aorist stems...' The older system shows a theoretical differentiation between the aorist and the imperfect in both aspects, but as can be seen from the paradigm (from Aronson) below it is only in the 2/3P sg that the two tenses are distinguished:

OLDER SYSTEM

<u>Imperfective</u>			<u>Perfective</u>	
aorist	imperfect		aorist	imperfect
dočakvax		1	dočakax	
dočakva	dočakvaše	<u>2-3</u>	dočaka	dočakaše
dočakvaxme		1	dočakaxme	
dočakvaxte		2	dočakaxte	
dočakvaxa		3	dočakaxa	

48. Howard I Aronson, Bulgarian Inflectional Morphophonology, p 155

In what Aronson has called the innovating system no such ambiguity can arise:

INNOVATING SYSTEM

Aorist (Perfective)		Imperfect (Imperfective)
dočakax	<u>1</u>	dočakvax
dočaka	<u>2-3</u>	dočakvaše
dočakaxme	<u>1</u>	dočakvaxme
dočakaxte	<u>2</u>	dočakvaxte
dočakaxa	<u>3</u>	dočakvaxa

Those alternations between aorist and imperfect which are still distinctive would be imperilled by the spread of this system. Such is the alternation s-š which appears in the verb opiša (p)⁴⁹ 'to describe': cf. aorist opisah⁵⁰: imp opišeh. The corresponding imperfective opposition is: 1P opisvah (aor): opisvah (imp); 2-3P opisva: opisvaše. The innovating system would lead to the loss of the imperfective aorist opisvah, but also the perfective imperfect opišeh, and would leave us with the following opposition: imperfect opisvah (i): aorist opisah (p).

It is likely that the growth of homonymous forms was a contributory factor in the development of this process. It is believed that the factor of homonymy alone would not be sufficient to explain this development, were it not for the close association

49. Aronson, op cit., p 156

50. Here we have replaced -x- by the usual transliteration used in this study -h-.

already noted between tense and aspect. It is idle to speculate on the eventual outcome of this development, nevertheless the present tendencies suggest a re-alignment of the tense-aspect relationship on the basis of a one to one opposition of tense and aspect, i.e. imperfect: imperfective - aorist: perfective.

4.30. Macedonian.

4.31. In the previous section reference was made to the subordination of tense to aspect. The closely related Macedonian language has travelled some distance along this path. Horace G Lunt in his Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language defines the imperfect (p 87): "General meaning: action viewed as contemporaneous with another moment in the past and non-distanced.... and further (foot p 87 - top p 88)... in the course of a narrative there is frequently a contrast of aorist (terminative)⁵¹ and imperfect (interminative)⁵¹ verbs. The aorists mark simple points in past time. They build a chain of events and actually tell the story, while the imperfects denote actions coordinated with the aorists. The imperfects paint the background against which the aorists take place." An example of a narrative sequence of aorists from V. Maleski-Tale's story "Mladosta na Frosina" (from Lunt, op cit, pp 140-151) shows how this tense provides the skeleton of the story: cf. 'Taa gi prodade dvata zagona kaj "Šarkinica", kupi obleka za umiračka i ne potera ni tri meseci - umre. "She sold two measures of land near "Šarkinica", bought some grave clothes and before three months were up - died" (Lunt, p 143). Conversely

51. Lunt uses terminative and interminative rather than the conventional perfective and imperfective.

a series of imperfects may occur together (cf. Mladosta na Frosina) (p 143): 'Vrvea godini. Jane sekoja zima ideše, ostanuvaše po nekoj mesec i pak se vraćaše vo Bukurešt. Frosina rađaše deca, i štom ke gi podrasteše, umiraa. Pet rodi, i site pet umrea.'

'The years passed. Jane came every winter, stayed for a month or so and then returned to Bucharest. Frosina bore children, and when she had raised them a bit, they died. She bore five, and they all died.' The imperfect actions in this action are - to quote Lunt - "presented in the process of happening". They are also repeated. What is more important they are all dependent on the two aorists rodā, umrea which end the extract.

All the imperfects are imperfective with the exception of the form ke ... podrasteše and the important element here is the particle ke, which also functions as a marker of the future tense. The perfective imperfect as indeed the perfective present only occurs with certain modal particles - notably ke and da. The particle ke is interesting since it may render iterative actions in addition to the future in the past, and potential actions.

4.32. The imperfective aorist is rare. With the repetition of the verb the use of the imperfective may merely point to the intensity of the action. More frequently such forms are found when it is a question of an action covering a specific period of time, as in the example (Lunt, op cit, p 95): 'Dva i pol meseca toj sede bez robota.' "For two and a half months he sat around without work". The use of the imperfective aorist in such constructions arises from the fact that the aorist itself cannot express intensity or even limited duration, and one must have

recourse to other means to produce such nuances.

4.4. Summary.

4.41. Both South Slavic languages are in agreement on the role of the aorist as the narrative form. As a narrative form it is linked with the perfective aspect, yet its functional load is inherent. This is clear from the presence in a narrative sequence of aorists in the imperfective. There the properties which allow an aorist to function as the marker of individual moments in a narrative are still present since they derive from the tense and not from the aspect. The imperfective aorist, however, has acquired the additional nuances of intensity or duration and these features derive from the aspect and not from the tense.

4.32. The imperfective imperfect is the normal form and the appearance of this tense in perfective contexts is restricted in the two languages. In Macedonian in particular the perfective imperfect is only found in conjunction with certain modal particles.

4.43. A contributory factor which has led to the re-distribution of tense and aspect in both languages has been the reduction of effectiveness of those stem and suffixal morphemes which formerly (either in isolation or in combination) distinguished the two tense forms. This has resulted in the restriction in Macedonian of the perfective imperfect to the use with modal particles, and in Bulgarian in a tendency to form the imperfect exclusively from imperfective stems and the aorist from perfective stems.

4.44. It is now proposed to compare the past tense usage (i.e. aorist and imperfect) in Bulgarian with similar usage in Lithuanian and Latvian. For this purpose a questionnaire was prepared consisting of sentences in English; each informant was required to provide a version in his own language. It is hoped that by comparing the two Baltic languages with Bulgarian we shall obtain an insight into the development of these tense forms in Baltic.

5.0. A comparison of the simple past tense forms of Bulgarian, Lithuanian and Latvian.

5.1. In Bulgarian and Macedonian, as we have seen, the opposition of two simple past tense forms is an inherited feature, fully developed in OCS, and clearly of common Slavic origin. It must be stated here that no such opposition existed in the Common Baltic period, and therefore, such tense oppositions that do exist in the individual Baltic languages are the result of internal development within these languages.

5.2. The simple past tenses in Lithuanian are respectively the preterite and the frequentative past. The thematic morpheme marking the preterite consists of two alternants $-\bar{e}$ and $-\bar{a}$; to these thematic vowels the endings are added for person and number: 1 sg $-u$, 2 sg $-i$, 3P $-\acute{o}$, 1 pl $-me$, 2pl $-te$, giving the following paradigms:

	I	II
1 sg	$-\bar{a}u$	$-\bar{i}au$
2 sg	$-\bar{a}i$	$-\bar{e}i$
3P	$-\bar{o}$	$-\bar{e}$
1Ppl	$-\bar{o}me$	$-\bar{e}m\acute{e}$
2 pl	$-\bar{o}te$	$-\bar{e}t\acute{e}$

52

The distribution of the two classes need not concern us. Type II

52. Lithuanian also retains dual endings: 1 $-\bar{v}a$, 2 $-\bar{t}a$.

is purely preterital while type I is also found functioning as a present (i.e. matyti : 3P pres mato, žinoti, 3P pres žino). There is, however, no possibility of confusion between past and non-past since -o never occurs in the same role within one paradigm: i.e. 3P pres mato: 3P pret matė; 3P pres žino: 3P pret žinojo).

5.21. The frequentative past in Lithuanian differs from the preterite in that it belongs exclusively to type I, and the endings of type I are added onto the tense formant -dav-: the full form -davo (the 3P is used here for convenience) is then attached directly to the infinitive stem of the verb: eiti 'to go' : 3P eidavo; vesti 'to lead' : vedavo; sakyti 'to say' : sakydavo. Though the frequentative past forms part of the Lithuanian literary standard it is not a common Lithuanian feature but is confined to the Aukštaičiai dialect area. It is from this dialect that the standard language has acquired the tense. Since the fp is a relatively recent development and was originally confined to the Aukštaičiai area and those Žemaičiai speakers at the common frontier of the two dialect areas it has not spread beyond Lithuanian. Latvian as we shall see responds to the need for a past tense expressing habitual action in a totally different way.

5.3. The simple past tense in Latvian.

5.31. If the Literary Latvian language has not followed Lithuanian in developing a special suffix to express habitual or frequentative action in the past there can be no doubt that the preterite is of the same common Baltic origin as in Lithuanian. The marker of

the preterite in Latvian is -a. On account of the heavy stress on the first syllable in Latvian the original long vowel of this suffix has been shortened: the former long vowel is reinstated in reflexive forms of the past tense; cf. *nesti* 'to carry', pret *nesa*; refl *nesās*. There were originally two forms -ā and -ē as in Lithuanian, but -ā has everywhere been generalised in the standard language. In dialects the form nese has been retained beside the standard nesa.⁵³ These dial forms show the same relationship to the trans-intrans opposition that is found with the Lithuanian -o/-ė: cf *dega* 'burned' (intr); *dedze* (trans)...⁵⁴

5.32. The Latvian frequentative past.

Though there is no suffix in Latvian to indicate frequentative action that does not mean that Latvian has no means at its disposal to express this nuance. In the third chapter the aspect system in Latvian was discussed and the tendency towards analytical modes was observed. That this tendency should spread to the expression of other verbal nuances is to be expected. In the place of the Lithuanian suffix -davo appears a free or semi-free form. This free or semi-free form possesses the same functional load as the Lithuanian suffix. In this instance Latvian has made use of an auxiliary verb.

5.321. The vb mēgt.

53. Jotr, vol III, pp 211-212.

54. ChrSt., p 189.

If one looks up the verb mēgt in Mühlenbachs' Lettisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch, vol II, under mēgt (2) one finds the following explanation: "gewohnt sein, pflegen (mit abhäng. Infin)... This can be glossed in English by 'to be used to' and the construction of used followed by a dependent infinitive closely parallels the Latvian usage. Cf. the English sentence: 'Every year the used to travel to Europe to visit friends' The Latvian versions of this sentence all substitute the preterite of mēgt for the English words used to: La 1: Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apmeklētu draugus. All versions agree on the use of medza ceļot. The Lithuanian versions of the same sentence have važiudavo (2 X), keliudavo (1 X) and finally keliave (1 X), thus showing a preference for the frequentative past in this context. Similarly the Bulgarian versions both have the imperfect pātuvaha.

The construction mēdza followed by a dependent infin in the above example bore the same functional load as the Lithuanian vb form in -davo, or the Bulgarian imperfect pātuvaha; i.e. this construction served to convey the notion of past habitual action. It is important to examine the range of meaning of this construction and also of the Lithuanian fp in -davo.

5.322. As important as the range of meaning of these forms is the regularity of distribution. If the regularity of distribution is low it may be impossible to establish an effective opposition between these forms and the preterite. Again the preferences of individual informants is to be regarded as idiosyncratic unless they are confirmed by other informants or from other sources.

5.33. Initially it was decided to take as a basis for comparison the Lithuanian versions. The reason for this choice was the fact that Lithuanian seemed to occupy an intermediate position between the well established Bulgarian position and the less well defined Latvian usage of *mēgt*. Moreover the Lithuanian fp forms a part of the normal Lithuanian vb paradigm whereas no prescriptive grammar of Latvian allots such a place to the construction with *mēgt*.

5.34. There can be no doubt that the Lithuanian fp has a high frequency and it bears a similar relationship to the preterite that we find between the Bulgarian imperfect and aorist. In a narrative sequence it is the preterite that tells the story while the fp is dependent on the other events or else provides a background against the which the main events unfold. In the following example from Juozas Baltušis (TKN p 64) the dead teacher's wife Zilaitienė is not sure what to think of the man Jonas Kaupys who has entered her life: 'Mažai ir tepažįstami buvo, tik iš tolo pasisveikindavo.'

"They were only slightly acquainted, they had only been in the habit of exchanging greetings". The form pasisveikindavo is dependent on the first part of the sentence tepažįstami buvo since it elaborates on the type of relationship that existed between Zilaitienė and Jonas Kaupys; secondly it stresses the habitual nature of the act of 'exchanging greetings'; thirdly it is perfective and the series of habitual action is looked upon as being already completed before the moment of utterance.

5.341. Verbs in the frequentative past may occur simultaneously

or virtually at the same time. Again from Juozas Baltušis (TKN) (p65):

'Nežinojo, kad rytais Jonas Kaupys rasdavo prie durų prismeigtą, raštelį su keiksmais ir grūmojimais. Jis suplėšydavo, tylėdamas imesdavo pakurton krosnį, o kitą rytą vėl skubėjo pirmas prie durų - nuplėsti popierių, kol Zilaitienė nepakilo, nepastebėjo nieko.' "She didn't know that in the morning Jonas Kaupys used to find stuck to the door a slip of paper with curses and threats on it. He would tear it up, and without speaking throw it into the stove which he had lit, and yet another morning he hurried first to the door to tear the paper up before Zilaitienė got up and noticed it". The series of frequentative past tenses depends initially on the verb nežinojo (She didn't know). The actions of the vbs rasdavo, suplėšydavo, imesdavo are all very short and for this reason are perfective. Because they are so short they may be regarded as happening virtually at the same time. They are in contrastive opposition to the verb skubėjo which refers to one specific event and represents a resumption of the narrative.

5.342. The common feature to be found in all the examples cited above is frequentativeness. Moreover not only are the actions frequent but they are characterised by regularity. When Jonas Kaupys found the slip of paper, tore it up and threw it into the stove that had been lit, the actions form a regular pattern. Similar are the fp actions in a further example from Juozas Baltušis (PTD p 41): Vakaraš įjungdavo radiją arba televizorių ir tuoj pasiimdavo į rankas japonišką dramblio kaulo liūtą. "In the evenings she would turn on the radio or television and straight-

away take into her hand the ivory Japanese lion." The regularity of these actions is confirmed by the use of the adverbial element Vakarais 'in the evenings'. Again on page 45 of the same story:

Nuo to laiko aš visada rasdavau kavą jau paruoštą. "From that time on I always found the coffee already prepared." This sentence is followed by other verbs in the same tense, all referring to the habitual nature of the preparations made to receive the narrator when he called. Yet in the same paragraph: Apie viską ji kalbėjo laisvai,... "She talked on every subject freely,... Here the emphasis does not lie on the repetitive or habitual nature of the action but rather on the fact that it is a general statement. This statement refers to a time prior to the moment of utterance but is valid both then and subsequently.

5.40. If one may posit the habitual-iterative role for the Lithuanian frequentative past it would be logical to suppose that the Latvian mēgt would play the same role. Nevertheless it is important to establish the range of meaning and distributional range of this form. In the following example which is taken from a translation (1954) of George Orwell's Animal Farm we find the construction with mēgt used to translate a habitual past action (DzF p 12) pirms daudz gadiem, kad es vēl biju mazs sīvēns, mana māte un pārējās oūcenes mēdza dziedāt vecu dziesmu, no kurās tās zināja tikai meldiju pirmos trīs vārdus. (Orwell's original version: Many years ago when I was a little pig, my mother and the other sows used to sing a song of which they knew only the tune and the first three words). And from the same text: (AF p 48) 'It was noticed that they wagged their tails to him in

the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones'.

"Tie vicināja savas aštes, viņam klātesot, tāpat kā citi supi to mēdza darīt ar Džonsu." And further from an original Latvian source, Jānis Jaunssudrabiņš from Baltā grāmata (p 135) 'Daži to mēdza darīt tikai Lieldienās rītā.': "Some would do this only on Easter morning".

The next group of examples is taken from the answers to the questionnaire. The first sentence was: Every year they used to travel to Europe to visit friends'. Since all the answers were in agreement here one version should suffice: "Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apciemotu draugus." And sentence 13: 'He handed over a book to each of the children; every birthday they used to receive a new book'. Four out of five informants agreed on the use of mēdza in this example, thus: (La 2) "Viņš pasniedza grāmatu katram no bērniem : katrā dzimšanas dienā viņi mēdza saņemt pa jaunai grāmatai. The fifth informant used the preterite in his version (viņi saņēma), and indeed it could be argued that the habitual nature of the action is already self-evident from the use of the adverbial phrase katrā dzimšanas dienā (on every birthday). Nevertheless the Lithuanian version has: "Jis įteikė po knygos kiekvienam vaikui; kiekvieno gimtadienio proga jie gaudavo po knygos." Whatever differences exist between the four versions all are agreed on the use of the frequentative past gaudavo. Again in sentence 27, 'He always wrote to his parents when he was away from home', three out of four Lithuanian informants prefer the fp, and one of the three even used rašinėdavo , thereby doubly stressing the regularity and frequency of the action. Four of the Latvian informants, however, use the preterite

rakstīja; only one (La 2) emphasises the habitual nature of the action: mēdza rakstīt. Again in sentence 28: 'He threw the logs onto the fire which soon burnt ~~more~~ brightly. Then from time to time he would throw another log on to keep the fire in.' The Lithuanian versions have rendered would throw by imesdavo (twice) and užmesdavo (once). The Latvian versions are : piemeta (La 5 and La 2), iemeta (La 1) meta (La 4) and medza iesviest (La 3). Only one informant has used mēdza; it is, however,, not the same as in sentence 27, (La 2); he admitted in a conversation about the use of mēdza that he showed a preference for the form.

5.41. An examination of the above examples leads one to suspect that potentially the construction of mēgt followed by a dependent infinitive is more widespread than a quantitative analysis would suggest. It is true that a certain amount of controversy surrounds the construction with mēgt. One informant (La 5) maintained that the construction was obsolescent and he used mēdza only in sentence 1. Another informant (La 1), a schoolgirl from Soviet Latvia used the form twice (sentence 1 and sentence 13). The highest count is La 2 with five examples (sentences 1, 13, 20 and 27). Next in order comes La 3 with three examples (sentences 1, 13, and 28). La 4 agrees with La 1 both in the number of examples (2) and in the particular examples chosen (sentences 1 and 13). It is interesting that age appears to have had little influence: La 1 is very much younger than La 4. Moreover in view of her origins one would expect to find here the most recent usage.

5.42. If one arbitrarily selects the four examples - sentences

1, 13, 20 and 27 as a normal potential distribution, one factor stands out: three contain some form of the word katrā (every): katru gadu (1) katrā dzimšanas dienā (13); katru nedēļu (20). Sentence 27 contains the adverb vienmēr (always, constantly, perpetually, *LaetUr*), but here too one could re-phrase the sentence: 'Every time he was away from home he used to write to his parents'. All these verbal actions show not only a high degree of frequency but also of consistency. They take place at regular intervals: katru gadu; katrā dzimšanas dienā; katru nedēļu. Similar is the example from Jānis Jaunsudrabiņš: Daži to mēdza darīt tikai Lieldienās rītā.' (JJBGr p 132). Here the action mēdza darīt has as a referent the phrase tikai Lieldienās rītā.

5.421. The referent need not always be such a clearly defined period of time. The two examples from Dzīvnieku Farma refer to less well-defined periods. In the first example the lapse of time is quite extensive: (DzF p 12) 'Pirms daudz gadiem, kad es vēl biju mazs sivēns, mana māte ... mēdza dziedāt... Here mēdza dziedāt refers to the clause kad es vēl biju mazs sivēns. In the second sentence, the dogs wag their tails as other dogs used to do with Jones ... tāpat kā oīti supi mēdza darīt ar Džonsu.' The period referred to is limited only at the upper end by the revolt of the animals.

5.4211. A comparison with the Lithuanian versions of certain sentences from the questionnaire show that all the time referents may be present and yet the Latvian informants do not use mēgt. One such sentence is number two: The farmer drove into the market

regularly; there he bought what he needed and sold his produce. Once a year he sold a bull.' All the Lithuanian forms use the fp throughout and this is what one might expect. All the actions are habitual even though the time elapsed in the case of the last verb sold is longer than with the other verbs. Since all are in agreement one example should suffice: "Ūkininkas regulariai važiuodavo į turgų; šis jus pirkdavo kas jam reikalinga ir parduodavo savo gaminius. Kartą metuose jis parduodavo bulių." (L3). And a corresponding Latvian version is: "Lauksaimnieks brauca uz tirgu regulāri; tur viņš pirka ko viņam vajadzēja un pardēva savus ražojumus. Reizi gadā viņš pardēva bulī." (La 4). Potentially the Latvian version could substitute forms with mēgt for all the simple preterites which depend on regulāri and reizi gadā. Thus, mēdza, braukt, mēdza pirkt and mēdza pārdot (twice). It could be remarked that this is not necessary since the habitual nature of the action is adequately marked by the presence of the adverbs regulāri and reizi gadā. Nevertheless the habitual construction is used with mēgt in other instances where the habitual nature of the action is indicated by adverbs: cf. sentences 1, 13, 20, 27 and 28.

5.430. The emphatic nature of mēgt.

5.431. Though potentially the construction with mēgt could form the basis for an habitual past, in opposition with the simple preterite, the potentiality of this form has not been realised. Its low frequency when compared with the Lithuanian frequentative past in -davo must be put down to the emphatic colouring of the

lexeme mēgt. When mēgt is found with such adverbs as katru gadu, katru nedēļu, katrā dzimšanas dienā, laiku pa laikam etc.. it emphasises the habitual nature of the action, but that the action is habitual is clear from the adverbs used. Where the time referent does not possess this habitual colouring mēgt is more likely to be used.

5.432. Whenever the Latvian speaker uses mēgt in Lithuanian a form in -davo is used. The exceptions to this are few. If we take the maximum number of sentences where mēdza is present and analyse them the relationship between the two forms will become clear: sentence 1 - važiūdavo (L 1 and 3), keliavo (L 4), keliaudavo (L 2): mēdza ceļot; sentence 13 - gaudavo (L 1, 2, 3 and 4): mēdza sapemt (La 1, 2, 3 and 4), sapēma (La 5); pareidinėjai (L 2), present (L 1), grįždavai (L 3 and 4): atgriezies/nāci (La 1), mēdzāt atgriezties/nākt/brukt (La 2), pārbraucāt (La 3), present (La 5); S 27 - rašydavo (L 1 and 3), rašinėdavo (L 4), rašė (L 2): rakstīja (La 1, 3, 4 and 5), mēdza rakstīt (La 2); S 28 - īmesdavo (L 3 and 4), užmesdavo (L 1), omitted (L 2): mēdza iesviest (La 3), piemeta (La 2 and 5) iemeta (La 1), meta (La 4).

If we attempt to quantify these results by giving a plus to all forms of the habitual past and a minus to all preterites (and inaccurate renderings in other than past tenses) the following pattern arises:

s 1 - L :	plus 3; minus 1	La :	plus 5
s 13 - L :	plus 4; minus 0	La :	plus 4; minus 1
s 20 - L :	plus 2; minus 2	La :	plus 1; minus 4
s 27 - L :	plus 3; minus 1	La :	plus 1; minus 4
s 28 - L :	plus 3; minus 1	La :	plus 1; minus 4

The Lithuanian totals are: plus 15 and minus 4; the Latvian: plus 12 and minus 13. Even when one allows for the fact that the minus totals include errors in the rendering of the English sentences (including in one case omission) the differences are quite striking. The preference shown for the fp in contexts where the action is habitual shows a proportion of over 3 : 1. In the Latvian versions the proportions are nearer 45 - 50. The above quantification is not absolutely accurate but does, it is hoped show the general tendencies of the two languages.

5.433. The above comparison of Lithuanian and Latvian usage shows how Lithuanian has travelled further along the road taken by the Slavic languages (albeit at a considerably later date) in the creation of a contrastive opposition between simple past tenses. The Latvian construction with the appropriate tense of *mēgt* followed by a dependent infinitive is not used sufficiently frequently to form the basis of such an opposition. The factor that has prevented this construction from assuming the functional load of the Lithuanian frequentative past is assuredly not the analytical form of the construction since both Baltic languages tolerate compound tenses, for instance the tenses of the Latvian relative mood. Moreover the more conservative Lithuanian exhibits a

frequentative variant of the remote past (pluperfect), formed with the aid of the fp form of the vb 'to be', cf. s 27: (L 3) 'Jis visuomet rašydavo tėvams, kai būdavo išvažiavęs iš namų' (He always wrote to his parents when he was away from home). In fact Latvian shows a preference for the analytical rather than the synthetic type of construction (cf. the analytical construction used to create imperfective equivalents for prefixed perfective vbs). The real cause is to be found in the fact that the construction with mēgt has not attained grammatical status but has remained a stylistic variant of the preterite.

It is true that the construction with mēgt is more highly specialised than the preterite which, at least in the imperfective aspect, contains a habitual frequentative nuance. Yet the preterite used to describe habitual past action is not itself characterised by this nuance to the exclusion of all other shades of meaning: it is arguable that the frequentative-habitual nuances are in fact derived from the aspect rather than the tense. The habitual nature of the action is in any case indicated externally, i.e. by adverbial elements. Though the construction with mēgt may be and often is accompanied by the same adverbial elements the habitual nature of the action is inherent in the vb mēgt and the adverbial markers are here redundant.

5.434. The relationship of the construction with mēgt to the aspect system is rather complicated. One informant on being consulted (La 2) stated that in his opinion the forms with mēgt are automatically imperfective despite the forms of the infinitive. Thus sapemt (s 13) and iesviest (s 28) are technically perfective vbs, yet the combination mēdza sapemt and mēdza iesviest are to be re-

garded as imperfective. It is true that, while iterative vb forms can occur in the perfective aspect habitual verbs are by their very nature excluded from this aspect. In Lithuanian too according to L Dambriūnas the fp (imperfectum consuetudinis) "... is less perfectivising than the past-tense form. For this reason some of these forms are neutral while the corresponding past-tense forms are perfective. For instance, the past-tense forms atėjo, atidarė, išėjo, pardavė, atidavė are perfective while ateidavo, atidarydavo, išeidavo, parduodavo, atiduodavo are neutral. (LP 7 p 258)⁵⁵

The neutral forms, of course, derive their aspect from their context. In sentence 2, for instance, all the vbs in the fp are imperfective: Ūkininkas regulariai važiuodavo į turgų; šia jis pirkdavo kas jam reikalinga ir parkuodavo savo gaminius. Kartą metuose jis parduodavo bulių. (The farmer drove into market regularly; there he bought what he needed and sold his produce. Once a year he sold a bull). Each action in this sentence may be regarded as completed on each specific occasion. Nevertheless the series of actions whether it be 'driving into market', 'buying what he needed', 'selling his produce' and 'selling a bull', is not envisaged as completed. In purely formal terms, however, važiuodavo and pirkdavo are imperfect while parduodavo (2 X) are perfective.

m Similarly in sentence 29 we have an opposition between išėjo preterite and išeidavo fp where the aspectual and temporal differences between the two forms of išeiti is explicit from the

55. ateiti 'to come'; atidaryti 'to open'; išeiti 'to go out'; parduoti 'to sell'; atiduoti 'to give back'.

context. 'Nustojo lyti ir du broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Paprastai jie visuomet maždaug šiuo lai ku išeidavo lauk.' (The rain stopped and the two brothers went out into the village street. They usually went out at about this time). In the first sentence išėjo and nustojo are on the same grammatical level: both are perfective, formally and from the context, where they point to two separate moments in a narrative sequence. The form išeidavo on the other hand is imperfective and the context is imperfective. The two vbs nustojo and išėjo refer to specific single actions while išeidavo refers to a series of actions, each one of which is finished but not the series.

Yet the basic ideational content of these actions in the fp are frequentative-habitual with perhaps slightly more stress on the habitual nuance. The next task is to decide on the range of meaning that can be assigned to the fp. That it possesses a high frequency count (in one paragraph of Petras Cvirkas' Zemė Maitintoja, p 52 - 3, it occurs no fewer than twelve times) is self-evident. Does it, however, possess the range of the Bulgarian imperfect? This is the problem we shall study in the next section, comparing the Lithuanian past tenses not with Latvian but with Bulgarian.

5.50. A comparison of past tense usage in Lithuanian and Bulgarian.

5.51. Again it seemed more convenient to take those sentences where Lithuanian uses the fp and subsequently consider those sentences where Bulgarian uses the imperfect, but Lithuanian

does not use the fp. Despite the relatively high frequency in the texts studied the fp was only used in seven sentences (1, 2, 13, 20, 27, 28 and 29), two more than the outside total for Latvian. As a result it is not proposed to study these in detail. Suffice it to say that in all cases the fp corresponded to the Bulgarian imperfect. On the other hand not every sentence showed a choice of the fp which was 100%. In sentence 27, for instance, two informants used rašydavo, one rašinédavo, i.e. a frequentative habitual suffix added to an iterative-intensive stem. It must be borne in mind then that the marker of the frequentative past is in certain sense in competition with the derivational suffixes -inēti and -iota which with simple verbs are markers of iterative-intensive action. Cf sentence 25: 'He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.' - (L1) Jis bégiojo iļ vienos vietos ; kitā, dirbdamas šī bei tā." or (L2) "Jis bēginējo pirmyn ir atgal, šia šiuo, šia tuo ušsiindamas." L3 and L4 used the preterite lakstējo. A fifth informant who was consulted suggested that the iterative-intensive form of this vb should be used: lakstinējo, though it must be admitted that the basic meaning of this vb is 'to flit about'. Nevertheless the contexts suggests that we are concerned with an intensive type of action. There is a general impression of "busyness" - if somewhat ill-directed - and the intensive form of these vbs would give the most accurate translation.

We are concerned here with one particular series of actions and not an habitual series, thus excluding the frequentative past. The Bulgarian versions of this sentence are: 'Taj tičāše nasam-natam kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova (B1 and 2). From the

presence in these versions of the imperfect one may conclude that the Bulgarian imperfect is capable of expressing intensiveness in a past action. The Lithuanian fp on the other hand is not capable of expressing this kind of verbal action. In such instances the preterite is used. The preterite, moreover, is likely to be formed on one of the two iterative-intensive stems.

Another example of the iterative-intensive usage is to be found in sentence 23; 'The shop door was constantly opening and shutting' (B2) 'Vratata na magazina se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše postojanno". (B1) "Vratata na magazina neprekāsnato se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše". In fact the action here described is not purely iterative-intensive but is merging into the continuous process, so close are the individual action of opening and shutting to one another. From a sequence of points on the time scale they are being transformed into a straight line.

The Lithuanian versions all use the imperfective form of the verbs 'to open' and 'to shut'. Thus, (L1): 'Krautuvės durys visą laiką atsidarinėjo ir užsidarinėjo.' Other versions prefer the participial construction: (L4) Parduotuvės durys visą laiką buvo atidarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos. The choice of the vb forms in -inėti is significant. Since the tense is preterite and not frequentative past the iterative-intensive nature of the action is indicated by the use of the imperfective aspect.

The Latvian versions of this sentence are not so consistent: two informants (La 3 and 4) use the formally perfective verbs: Veikala durvis pastāvīgi atvērās un aizvērās; La 5 uses the imperfective form of these verbs(the analytical construction): Veikala durvis visu laiku vērās cīst un valā; La 1 and 2 use the

iterative-intensive verb virināt(ies) 'to keep opening and shutting':

(La 1) Veikala durvis virinājās nepārtraukti; La 2 has: Veikala durvis tika virinātas nepārtraukti. The last two translations are of course, the most exact. The imperfective version of La 5 is also good in that the intensiveness of the action is carried not by the vb vērās but by the adverbs ciet and valā. The first two examples are not as emphatic as the other three.

Sentence 25 also shows the use of an intensive-iterative vb, the vb skraidīt 'to run, scurry about' (particularly with the adverbs of place - šurp and turp). Four of the five informants have shown a preference for skraidīt (La 1 - 4) while La 5 uses the non-iterative verb skriet. Cf. La 1: 'Viņš skraidīja šurp un turp, un darija te šo, te to.' The form skraidīt can be compared with the L forms bēsioti and bēginēti. It is interesting too to note that the Bulgarian imperfect tičaše is also an iterative: tičam 'to run about' (i) beside the normal imperfective teka 'to run'.

5.52. Hitherto we have considered the Bulgarian imperfect (or its equivalents in the Baltic languages) as a means of expressing habitual-frequentative or iterative-intensive actions.⁵⁶

56. The use of the hyphen in the terms habitual-frequentative and iterative-intensive is deliberate. It is rare to find a habitual action that is not at the same time frequentative (or iterative). Similarly a thematic suffix which is described as iterative may also function in intensive contexts. In fact the range of meaning from habitual to intensive is to be looked on rather as a continuum though as we have seen the means by which these nuances are expressed is different.

The imperfect may be, and often is used to describe continuous processes, processes which are not the result of a series of actions but continue without interruption from one moment of time to another.

A good example of this use of the imperfect is found in the Bulgarian version of the Communist Manifesto of 1848. (CMB) (p 42) "No vse poveče se razrastvaha pazarite, vse poveče rastjaha potrebnotite.

I manufakturata veče ne možeše da gi zadovolji." "Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. And the industry was no longer able to satisfy them." (CME p 44). The verb možeše (not underlined) in the last sentence represents a different type of action from that of the verbs razrastvaha and rastjaha but all three are in contrastive opposition to the series of aorists which follow:

'Togava parata i mašinata izvāršiha revoljucija v promišlenoto proizvodstvo. Na mjestoto na manufakturata dojde sāvremennata čdra industrija, na mjestoto na promišlenoto sredno sāslovie dojdoha industrialcite milioneri, šefovete na celi industrialni armii, sāvremennite buržoa.' "Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, and the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois." (ME p 44). The relationship between the three imperfects and the aorists which follow is clear. All three provide the conditions, the background favouring the changes which were to take place.

The Baltic texts show a similar relationship between the processes of the first sentences of this paragraph and the events in the second half. Only here the opposition is an aspectual one since the tense used throughout is the preterite. Cf. (CML p 30):

Bet rinkos vis augo, paklausa vis kilo. Ir manufaktūra jau

nebēgalējo jos patenkinti. All the verbs here are imperfective since we are describing not a series of completed actions but processes. The vb nebēgalējo like možēš is a general statement of 'incapacity to satisfy the new needs arising out of the aforementioned processes.' The Latvian version does not differ substantially from the Lithuanian: Bet tīrģi arvien pieauga, pieprasījums palielinājās. Arī manufaktūra nespēja vairs to apmierināt. (CMLa p 40) The forms pieauga and palielinājās appear to be perfective, but are not in fact. The form pieaugt is not the perfective of the simple verb augt but has a slightly different range of meaning, augt is usually 'to grow' in the literal sense, though it does have a secondary meaning comparable to that of palielināties; pieaugt is in general more abstract. The second verb palielināties does not appear to possess a simple form. Abstract verbs of this kind do not appear in the analytical form.

The second half of the paragraph does not present any problems of this type: (CML pp 3- - 31) Tuomet garas ir mašina padarē revolūciju pramonēje. Manufaktūros vietā užēmé šiuolaikinē stambioji pramonē, ī pramonēs viduriniojo luomo vietā stojo pramonininkai- milijonierai, ištisų pramonēs armiju vadovai, šiuolaikiniai buržuai. And the Latvian: (CML pp 40 -41) Tad tvaiks un mašīnas izdarīja revolūciju rūpnieciskajā ražošanā. Manufaktūras vietā stājās modernā lielrūpniecība, rūpnieciskās viduskārtas vietā stājās industribas miljonāri, veselu rūpniecisku armiju pavēlnieki, modernie buržuji. In the Lithuanian version there is a series of completed actions: padarē revolūciju..., ... vietā užēmé..., ī ... vietā stojo. Both padarē and užēmé are clearly perfective while stojo is bi-aspectual though perfective

in this context. In this context stoti is being used idiomatically; i vieta użimti and vieta użimti both mean 'to take the place of', but it is from its original meaning 'to stand' (intr) that one can deduce its bi-aspectuality. The same point may be made of the Latvian stāties vieta 'to stand or be in the place of'. The first verb of the Latvian series izdarīja (revolūciju) is indubitably perfective. All three verbs function as markers of narrative events while the first three vbs in the imperfective are dependent on the second group. The Bulgarian version makes this distinction both through a difference of tense (aor: imp) and by a difference of aspect: the first three vbs in the imperfect are all imperfective while the last three in the aorist are perfective.

5.53. Another characteristic of the Bulgarian imperfect is its ability to express duration of an action. An example of this type of imperfect action comes from a Bulgarian translation of Solohov's Sud'ba Čeloveka: 'Čste dokato pušehme mālčalivo, az razgleždah skrištom baštata i sinčeto i s učudvane si otbeljazah edno stranno spored mene obstojatelstvo'. (SnC p 12) "While we were still smoking in silence I looked covertly at the father and son and to my astonishment I noticed what was in my opinion a strange circumstance." The vb pušehme is formally imperfect, and the use of this tense points to the duration of the action - 'while we were smoking'; there is no clear limitation imposed on this action. The form razgleždah⁵⁷

57. The formal distinctions which separate the aorist from the imperfect are often only vestigial (i.e. the -se of the 2/3P sg) and it is only from distributional criteria that one can decide which tense is being used. In the example cited above two factors decide: 1) the lack of limitation of the action and 2) the simultaneity of.

again points to an action of some duration which takes place simultaneously to the action of 'smoking'. The past vb otbeljazah is, however, aorist: here we are concerned with an action of very short duration which took place at a moment as yet undefined within the longer period covered by the other verbs. Moreover, this action was definitely completed before the moment of utterance, hence the aspect (perfective) of otbeljazah.

Another example of the durative use of the imperfect from the same source (SnCp 12):...' "We began to smoke the stronger of home-grown tobacco..." Here we have an inceptive aorist: again there is a contrast of both tense and aspect. Further up the same page there is a perfective aorist from the verb mālča 'to be silent': Toj mlākna za malko, posle zapita:...! "He fell silent for a short while and then asked:..." The external criteria influencing the choice of tense are respectively the adverbial elements dālgo 'for a long time' and za malko 'for a short while', but more important is the fact that the aorist is the tense of narration. In the utterance 'Toj mlākna za malko, posle zapita: the two aorists refer specifically to moments in a narrative: moreover they follow one another. The utterance i dālgo mālčahme refers to an action which took place simultaneously with the main event

as described by the inceptive aorist Započihme...

5.54. There remain more generalised imperfects: i.e. those which are not accompanied by any specific referents either to time or to manner. The following examples are taken from Sādbata na Čoveka (SnC p 12): - vsičko pokazvaše ženska grižovnost, umeli majčini rāce'.... all of which pointed to a woman's care, the skilful hands of a mother; 'A bāwtata izgledaše drugojače:... "But the father looked different:...; 'toj nosaše počti novi vojniški obušta,...' "he was wearing almost new military footwear". The actions described by the imperfects pokazvaše, izgledaše, neseše are purely descriptive. They tell us something about the dramatic personae or about the milieu in which the actions take place. In the sense that they are static and not dynamic they may be compared to statal verbs (leža 'to lie', stoja 'to stand, stay'). Another example of this type of usage is taken from Šolohov: 'Vsički raboteha v kamenni karieri, dālbācha rāčno, ražeha, drobjahe germanskijska kamānak.' "They all worked in stone quarries, dug (it) out by hand, cut, crushed the German stone." (SnC p 35).

5.55. It is not intended to study in detail the uses of the Bulgarian imperfect, which has moreover been covered recently by the Bulgarian linguist V. Stankov in his Imperfektāt v sovremennija bālgarski knižoven ezik. Nevertheless it can be seen already that the Bulgarian imperfect has a much wider range of meaning than the corresponding Baltic forms. In fact it is only in habitual-intensive and habitual-frequentative contexts that one finds

direct correspondences between the Bulgarian imperfect and the Lithuanian fp and in the latter case the *La mēgt* construction where this is used.

5.551. It is in those instances where the Baltic languages use the preterite that aspect plays a significant role. Thus a formal statement of the relationship between the B imperfect and the Lithuanian fp might be formulated as follows: B Imp = L fp + pret (asp). Here the significance of the factor of aspect which is additional to the preterite lies in the fact that the aspect possesses those additional nuances which are not clearly marked in the preterite tense itself. The Lithuanian preterite is not specifically marked for duration since it may also play a narrative role. This narrative role belongs to the aorist in Bulgarian and other nuances are attributes of the imperfect. Though in many cases the Bulgarian imperfect will also be imperfective in terms of aspect the overlap in function between tense and aspect deprives the aspect of the major part of its significance. In the following sentence from the translation of the Communist Manifesto an imperfect (i) is contrasted with an aorist (p):

Tja bezmilostno razkūsa pāstrite feodālī okovī, koito vrāzvaha čoveka za negovīte "testestveni povelītelī",... (CMB p 43). The Lithuanian version has a preterite in the second clause corresponding to the Bulgarian imperfect: Margus feodalinius pančius, kurie rišo žmogų prie jo "prigimtinių viešpačių", ji negailėstingai sutraukė... (CML p 32). The Lithuanian preterite is imperfective and this use of the aspect outlines the general nature of the action ("It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties

that bound man to his "natural superiors",... CME p 46). This function of aspect is not so clear in the Latvian version which in this instance has not used the analytical construction: *Tā kēlastības sarāvusi tās raibās feodālās saites, kas cilvēku piesaistīja viņa "dabiskajiem pavēlniekiem",... (CMLa p 42)*⁵⁸

The weighting that must be given to the use of the imperfective aspect in the Lithuanian version is obviously greater than in the Bulgarian.

5.552. The situation is different when we come to consider the aorist. There aspect will play a more significant role. Whereas the imperfect in Bulgarian is normally associated with the imperfective aspect, a tendency which is becoming more strongly established, the aorist in its turn is associated with the perfective aspect. Where the aorist appears in the imperfective aspect it possesses some additional nuance of meaning which is not normally proper to the aorist as a tense but derives from the use of the imperfective aspect.

5.553. The tense corresponding to the aorist in the two Baltic languages is the preterite. In these languages too the preterite

58. The use of the analytical form is restricted in Latvian by several factors. In this instance the compound verb piesaistīt is used in a context of high abstraction. These are not direct links of some material joining a man to his superiors but ties based on centuries of tradition and usage.

when used in the functional role of marker of the moments of a narrative will be in the perfective. However, imperfective preterites will be found, just as imperfective aorists are found, and the attempt will be made to analyse these departures from the norm. Mention must also be made here of the use of the perfect in place of the preterite. This usage is more frequent in Latvian than in Lithuanian, which tends to suggest that the original meaning of the perfect - a present state resulting from an action completed before the moment of utterance - has been much weakened.

5.60. The relationship of the aorist and the preterite in Bulgarian and Baltic.

5.61. It is more convenient to consider first the normal usage of these tenses, so let us look at some examples of the perfective aorist and preterite. Here are two examples from the questionnaire, the English version being given first: 'Few came to the meeting though many invitations were sent out'. The Bulgarian versions differ in the rendering of the word 'meeting' and in the arrangement of the clauses: (B1) *Văpreki ōe bjaha razpratani mnogo pokani, malko hora dojdoha no săbranieto; Malko hora dojdoha na sreštata, văpreki ōe bjaha razpratani mnogo pokani.* The aorist used in both cases, dojdoha is perfective, and we are clearly concerned with an action that is finished 'Few came to the meeting'.... and which forms part of a narrative sequence, even though in this example the sequence is understood.

The Baltic versions of this sentence agree with the Bulgarian in the choice of aspect and tense (preterite and perfective). A couple of examples of either language should suffice. First

the Lithuanian: (L3) Mažai atsilankė į susirinkimą, nors buvo išsiuntinėta daugelis pakvietimų; (L4) Mažai atvyko į susirinkimą, nors buvo išsiųsta daug pakvietimų. And the Latvian: (La 11) Nēdaudzi apmeklēja sanāksmi, kaut gan jīj izsūtīti daudz ielūgumu; (La 4) Maz atnāca uz sanāksmi, kaut gan daudz ielūgumu jīja izsūtīti. The Baltic versions show some variation in the choice of verb (L: atsilankė, atvyko, atėjo, teatėjo; La apmeklēja, atnāca, ieradās) though these differences are not significant, yet all are agreed on the choice of aspect and tense.

The second sentence (Q5) is longer and contains a larger number of verbs, and consequently the divergences are greater in the Baltic versions. The English version of this sentence is: "What has happened?" he asked. "Nobody knows", replied the bystanders. La 1 has the following version: "Kas noticijs?" viņš jautāja. "Neviens nezina", atbildēja klātesošie. La 2 has: "Kas noticijs?" viņš jautāja (vaicāja). "Neviens nezina(a)", atbildēja klātstāvošie.⁵⁹ The other three Latvian versions agree closely with the above; La 3, 4 and 5 use the fuller form of the perfect for the first vb "Kas ir noticijs". The Lithuanian versions are virtually identical and thus one version will suffice: (L1) "Kas atsitiko?" jus paklausė. Niekas nežino", atsakė šalia stovintieji. And finally the Bulgarian versions: (B 1) Kakvo se e slučilo? popita toj. Nikoj ne znae - otgovoriha horata, koito stoeha naokolo; (B 2) Kakvo se sluči? "popita toj." Nikoj ne znae otgovoriha stojaštite. The first point that arises from a study of these versions is the presence of a perfect in the translation of the question "What has happened?" in B 1 and in all the Latvian versions. The Lithuanian versions on the other hand show a

59. Colloquial usage often omits the final -a in zina (know/knows).

preference for the preterite. This is a confirmation of what was stated earlier (5.553) about the relative frequency of the perfect in Latvian in place of the preterite. Bulgarian shows a certain hesitancy in this respect: B 1 uses the perfect while B 2 uses the aorist.

5.611. The use of the perfect in place of the preterite is a not uncommon feature of modern Latvian. There is another instance of this usage in Q 15: "It has started", the people shouted when the earth began to tremble. It may be argued here that the use of the perfect is consistent with the original meaning of this tense at least in these instances: i.e. the perfect is to be viewed as a present state resulting from a past action. Yet in the second example two out of the five informants use the preterite. La 1 and 4 use 'Ir sācies', La 2 'Sācies'; La 3 and 5 use the preterite Sākas. The Lithuanian versions of this sentence all use the preterite prasidėjo or in one instance jau prasidėjo. The Bulgarian versions agree with the Lithuanian in using a simple past tense, the aorist: započna. Nevertheless there is no essential difference between the two contexts. In fact the utterance "It has started" could serve as a reply to the question in Q 5 "What has happened?" The use of the perfect in these sentences cannot therefore be considered as a purely grammatical response but is a matter of register. In this respect the greatest frequency in the use of the perfect as a substitute for the preterite belongs to Latvian. An earlier example of this usage was cited above (p 154) where the Latvian version of a sentence from the Communist Manifesto (CMLa p 42) contained the perfect sarāvusi (has... torn asunder) as

opposed to the Lithuanian preterite sutraukė and the Bulgarian aorist razkăsa.

5.62. The verbs of speaking (he asked, replied the bystanders) in Q 5 shows a further lack of consistency in the Baltic forms. The Bulgarian versions use the aorist in both cases: popita toj and otgovoriha... Moreover both aorists are in the perfective aspect. The Lithuanian version has respectively paklausė jis and atsakė.... perfective and preterite. The La versions have jaut-āja and atbildēja: preterite and imperfective and preterite and perfective. The attribution of aspect to the Latvian version is, of course, on a formal basis - jautāja (one version gives an alternative vaicāja) is simple and hence imperfective while atbildēja is compound and perfective. This divergence between jautāja and atbildēja is capable of being explained if we take the two vbs separately. The vb atbildēt is always found in the prefixed form and possesses no analytical imperfective form. Its aspect then depends on the context. In this context it is perfective. The vb jautāt (or vaicāt, they are virtually interchangeable) is normally found in the simple form, though prefixed and perfective forms do exist: pajautāt, izjautāt. These forms add definition to the basic meaning ask of the simple vb: pajautāt 'to ask (smb about smth), to inquire (of smb about smth or after smth) and izjautāt: to question, to examine, to enquire of. In other words the vb jautāt is used in most contexts where it is merely a question of 'asking'. The derivative forms pajautāt

and izjautāt would be more correctly termed Aktionsarten since no real change in meaning has taken place.

There is less dubiety about the aspectual category of the L forms paklausé and atsaké, which are perfective in terms of context and also from the fact that there exist for both words imperfective forms: paklausinēti paklausti; atsakinēti; atsakyti. Again the point must be made that in terms of distribution paklausti and atsakyti are commoner than their imperfective forms.

5.621. The verb 'shouted' in Q 15 is rendered with greater consistency in the Baltic versions than the vbs of 'saying' in Q 5. The Lithuanian versions all have šauké while the La versions have sauca (and twice kliedza). All are in the simple form. As was the case with jautāt (vaicāt) formally perfective forms L - šaukti 'to call, cry': pašaukti⁶⁰ La - saukti 'to call, shout, cry': pasaukti (to call); kliegt 'to cry, yell, etc.': nokliegt 'to shout'. In both languages, however, the simple forms are commoner in both imperfective and perfective contexts.

In this sentence the context is clearly perfective and this is the category to which all the verbs in the Baltic versions are to be attributed. And this attribution is derived exclusively from distributional criteria rather than formal criteria. The Bulgarian versions show one perfective, zakreštjaha, and one imperfective: vikaha. It is the imperfective form vikaha which is unexpected. One would have expected the perfective viknaha. It is possible that the act of shouting is to be regarded as a

60. More frequent than pašaukti is the form which refers to actions of very short duration: šuktelėti.

process and not a moment in the narrative, at any rate as an action whose completion is not envisaged.

The last verb in this sentence 'when the earth Began to tremble' is again perfective aorist in both the Bulgarian versions započna. In the Baltic languages the verb 'to begin', as indeed other auxiliary verbs, is neutralised with respect to aspect: i.e. where the simple form exists (L inti, La sākt) it will remain formally imperfective. Conversely a prefixed form like pradēti may also function in imperfective contexts.

5.63. The previous examples show a lack of consistency in respect of aspect. The Lithuanian and Latvian preterites examined, though perfective in distributional terms, i.e. they function as perfectives in these contexts, do not exhibit the formal criteria of this category. Certain factors have therefore intervened to inhibit this formal realisation of the perfective category.

5.631. Among these factors is the characteristic neutralisation of the formal markers of perfectivisation and imperfectivisation found with auxiliary verbs (in this instance La sāka, L pradējo/éné). This factor appears to derive from the dependent character of the vb when it functions as an auxiliary.

5.632. The second group of vbs where this inhibition appears consists of vbs of saying and perceiving. An example of a verb of perception is to be found in Q 7: 'We heard he came back on Thursday'. The L and La versions use the simple form of the vb Cf L - "Mes girdējome, ka Jis grīzē ketvārtadienī", and the La

- (la 4) "Mes dzirdējām ka viņš atnāca atpakaļ ceturtdienā".

The Bulgarian versions, however, both use the perfective aorist in this example: Cf (B 1) "Čuhme, če se e vārnal v četrvārtāk."

The same factors operate in the case of the preterites: L šaukē La sauca/kliedza. In other words the normal form is the simple form and compound forms of these words possess additional nuances.

5.633. It can be seen that the emphatic values of the Aktionsarten have not been entirely lost when the elements used to mark these Aktionsarten have been adapted to another purpose, to mark aspect. And this may be the reason why the doublets, L atsakinėti : atsakyti paklausinėti : paklausti are not in a 1 : 1 relationship in terms of aspect. Conversely with the bi-aspectual forms grįžti: sugrįžti 'to return); matyti: pamatyti (to see) and also equivalent La forms: redzēt: paredzēt (to see) etc., the simple forms are more frequently to be found than the compound forms.

5.634. The Baltic prefixes have in many cases retained a full meaning together with their grammatical function as markers of the perfective aspect. A prefix of this type is L nu- (La no-) when used with vbs meaning 'to kill' or 'to confer some serious disability on some person or object' (of the use above of no- and nost- with the La vb kaut 'to kill', 3.340)

The vb 'to shoot': L šauti (sāudyti), La šaut, is commonly used without a prefix. Cf Q9. 'The silence was interrupted by a shot. Somebody had no doubt been shooting at a wolf'. In this example all the La form versions use the non-prefixed form of the vb; cf. La 2: "Sāviens pārtrauce klusumu. Acimredzami kāds šava

uz vilku.", and La 5: "Šaviens pārtrauca klusumu; nebija šaubu, ka kāds šāva uz vilku." L 3 has the following: "Tyla buvo pertraukta šūvio. Be abejo, kažkas šovė į vilką." Or L 4: "Tylą pertraukė šūvis. Kažkas, tur būt, šovė į vilką". There is an example of the use of the L doublet šaudyti from Juozas Baltušis (TKN p 66): Jonas Kaupys neskubėdamas šaudė pro vieną ir antrą langelį, paskui išėjo į kiemą,..." "Unhurriedly Jonas Kaupys fired now through one window now the other, then went out into the yard,..." Though the actions of shooting are completed (they are followed directly by another action, went out), they are not followed by fatal results. Were the action of 'shooting' to end in the death of the person or animal shot at, the vb would have the prefix nu-, thus nušauti. An example of 'to shoot dead' occurs in the same source, but this time in the future; here Mrs. Zilaitienė warns Jonas Kaupys, a neighbour, who has come to stay with her, that the same bandits who murdered her husband will shoot him too.: "Nušaus tave" (They'll shoot you dead). "Gal nenušaus, atsakė jis. (And maybe they won't - he replied).

5.635. Unlike the examples from Juozas Baltušis the preterite L šovė and La šāva in Q 9 are imperfective. They do not form part of the main narrative sequence. The main event is in the first sentence "The silence was interrupted by the shot." Thus the second sentence adds information about the shot mentioned in the first sentence and is in this sense dependent on it. B 1 marks this dependence by the use of an imperfective imperfect: "Tišinata be narušeno ot izstrel. Nesānneno, njakoj streljaše po vālk." B 2 on the other hand used a pluperfect: "Tišinata

beše prikāsnata ot izstrel. Bezšāmneno, njakoj beše streljaj po vālk." The use of the pluperfect will tend to suggest that the act of shooting took place some time before the moment of speaking. Some La versions (La 3, 4) also favour the pluperfect but the participle is imperfective (i.e. šāvis not nošāvis).

5.636. There are, however, many instances where the prefix in Baltic has a purely grammatical significance: i.e. it is a marker of perfectivity. Examples of the grammatical use of the prefix are Q 12 and Q 13. Let us first examine Q 12: "What have I done?" he exclaimed when he saw the floor all covered with water. L 3 renders this sentence as follows: "Kā gi aš padarīju?" sušuko jis, kai pamatē kad ant grindų yra pilna vandens. All three verbs padarīju, sušuko and pamatē are perfective and are appropriately marked. This use of the perfective finds its parallel in the Bulgarian versions: (B 1) "Kakvo napravih?" vāžklīkna toj, kogato vidja, že celijat pod e pokrit s voda; (B 2) "Kakvo napravih?" vāžklīkna toj, kogato vidja, že celijat pod beše pokrit s voda. Of the three vbs 'he saw', L pamatē, B vidja precede in time the first two verbs since they represent a response to this action: On seeing the floor covered with water 'he exclaimed'. The prefix pa- in pamatē infers an action of extremely short duration, i.e. 'he caught sight of'. This nuance is not present in the B vidja. Or to put it another way, vidja is marked as a perfective, but not as a perfective with a special nuance of short sudden action.

The L padarīju and sušuko are on the same level since a speech sequence and the method by which it is expressed are obviously simultaneous. The form padarīju calls for no special

comment since it is the normal perfective form of darīau 'did': the prefix here is purely grammatical. The same cannot be said for sušuko 'exclaimed' which may be considered a perfective of lauké yet with a higher degree of specialisation. Moreover it is the same type of specialisation that is present in pamaté. Again we are concerned with a short sudden action which can scarcely be measured in terms of time elapsed. In this respect it closely resembles the suffixed form šuktélejo. The Bulgarian vbs napravih and vāzklīkna are normal perfective aorists without any special nuances.

The La versions are closer to the Lithuanian in that they lay greater stress on the type of perfective action. Cf. La 5 "Ko es izdarīju, viņš izsaucās, kad ieraudzīja, ka visu grīdu bija apludināta. The version offered by La 4 agrees with La 5 in the choice of the first two vbs: "Ko es esmu izdarījis?" viņš izsaucās, kad viņš redzēja visu grīdu apklātu ar ūdeni. In common with La 1, 2 and 3 he used the perfect for the first verb. More significant is his choice of redzēja; the choice of redzēja suggests that the informant in question regards the act of seeing as a process which is not limited by a time referent.

There is a similar response on the part of informants La 1 and 3: "Ko esmu izdarījis?" viņš izsaucās, kad redzēja, ka grīdu klāja; ūdens; "Ko es esmu izdarījis?" viņš iesaucās, kad viņš redzēja, ka visa grīda pārplūduse ar ūdeni. And indeed the sequence 'he saw' may be looked upon as an act without a specific time reference, or conversely attention may be drawn to the instantaneous nature of the act. La 3 uses iesaucās instead of izsaucās and in this context there is no difference between the

two forms.

The informant who gives the widest range of alternatives is La 2: "Ko es esmu nodarījis/ padarījis/ pastrādājis, viņš iesaucās ieraudzīdams, ka visa grīda pārklāta ar ūdeni... Nodarīt is more specific than either izdarīt or padarīt in that it implies some harmful outcome. The form padarījis is neutral while pastrādājis in this context equates with izdarījis, though the basic meaning of the vb strādāt is 'to work'.

5.637 Both La and L versions of Q 12 show a highly characteristic tendency to mark certain emphatic nuances in their use of the perfectivising prefixes. This tendency is to be contrasted with their lack of consistency in marking the aspectual polarity. The action in Q 13 is neutral in terms of emphasis and consequently there is a greater consistency of response. The La versions use either iedot or pasniegt, simple perfectives. Cf La 1: Viņš pasniedza (iedeva) katram bērnam grāmatu; ... The L versions too show a greater measure of agreement. Cf L 1: Jis iteikē knygu kiekvienam vaiku;... (He handed over a book to each of the children;...) or L 4: Kiekvienam vaiku jis padavē po knygu;... L 2 diverges sharply from this pattern: Jis davinēja kiekvienam vaiku po knygu;... In a perfective context the form davinēja is anomalous since it is not only imperfective but iterative-intensive. It is difficult to read either of these notions into this context. Moreover the verb here describes the main event of a narrative sequence, contrasting with the habitual-frequentative vb in the second sequence: every birthday they used to receive a new book. The Bulgarian versions recognise this fact when they

use the perfective aorist: (B21) Toj razdade po edna kniga na vsjako dete; (B 1) Toj podade kniga na vsjako dete;...

5.638. If one briefly summarises the foregoing one may arrive at the following conclusions: (1) The B aorist equates with the Baltic preterite or in some instances with the Baltic perfect. Latvian shows a stronger preference for the perfect than Lithuanian. Nevertheless the perfect has the same functional load as the preterite since the latter may be substituted for it. (2) The aspectual relationship is complicated by the large number in Baltic of bi-aspectual vbs: these vbs may appear as simplex or compound; many of these forms possess perfective and imperfective forms but the distributional frequency of these last is relatively low. (3) Lithuanian and Latvian make a greater use than Bulgarian of perfective Aktionsarten, i.e. of those prefixed forms where the verb is both perfective and endowed with a particular nuance of meaning appropriate to that aspect.

Hitherto we have been considering examples where the Bulgarian versions contain a perfective aorist. It is now time to turn briefly to a few instances where Bulgarian uses the imperfective aorist and study the reflexes in Baltic of this phenomenon.

5.70. The imperfect aorist in Bulgarian.

5.71. The aorist in Bulgarian is normally associated with the perfective aspect and here the aspect selected does not add any further nuance to the aorist, which itself refers to a completed action. The main functional characteristic of the aorist is that

of marking the moments in a narrative sequence and for this reason the imperfective aspect is also possible with this tense. Cf Q 10: "He continued on his way and walked for two hours. In all that time he saw only two people." Since B 1 and B 2 are in agreement the version offered by B 1 should suffice: Toj prodālzi pātja si i vārvja dva časa. Prez cjaloto vreme vidja samo dvama duši. In the above example the imperfective aorist vārvja is in effective contrast with the other aorists in the sentence prodālzi and vidja which are perfective. All three form part of the narrative sequence and hence each one marks a particular event or moment. One must therefore look outside this criterion if one wants to explain this difference in aspect. It will be noted that prodālzi and vidja are not marked for time elapsed whereas vārvja bears the referent dva časa 'two hours' and the task of the imperfective is to point to this lapse of time. The time elapsed in such constructions will always be clearly delimited. Though the marking of unlimited or undefined duration is a function of the imperfective aspect, lack of limitation or definition would not be consistent with the use of the aorist.

5.711. The Lithuanian versions do not show this contrast at all. Cf. L 1: Jis tesė savo kelionę ir ėjo dvi valandas. Per visą tą laiką jis matė tik du žmones. All the verbs are imperfective preterites and, while ėjo is justified on the grounds that it represents a lapse of time of fixed duration, another must be sought for tesė and matė. The form matė does not present great difficulty: it is bi-aspectual and the nuance attributed to the perfective form panatė of an action which is sudden and of short

duration is not appropriate in this context. It could not, however, be absolutely excluded. The subject of the action might have only caught a glimpse of the two people seen in the course of the two hour walk.

The form tesé unlike maté does not possess a prefixed form with the meaning of 'to continue'. LAZ/60 gives ištēsti 'to lengthen, protract, get on slowly with', uštēsti 'to lengthen, protract'. While these meanings are obviously related to that of the simple vb they are not appropriate in this context. It seems more realistic in this instance to consider testi a bi-aspectual vb like matyti but with a strong bias towards the imperfective. Moreover it is the sequence ėjo dvi valandas which dominates the two sentences and for the Lithuanian speaker this is more important than the mechanical allocation of a vb to the appropriate aspect.

The La versions show a similar tendency. Cf La 3: Vipš turpināja savu ceļu un gāja divas stundas. Pa visu šo laiku vipš redzēja tikai divus cilvēkus. This version closely parallels L 1 above. The same remarks apply to redzēja as to maté in L 1 and turpināt like the L testi does not possess a perfective form. It is possible to render he continued by a vb form which is both contextually and formally perfective, by using atjaunoja (lit 'resumed'); the form atjaunoja was put forward as an alternative by La 2. Similarly redzēja may be replaced by the perfective satika (lit met, came across), an alternative offered by La 1.

Perhaps the most interesting variant on the above version of La 3 is that offered by La 5. He agrees with La 3 in using turpināja and redzēja, however, for gāja he substitutes nogāja

which has the meaning of 'covering a fixed distance', of vipš nogāja desmit kilometrus - 'he covered ten kilometres', Laotur. Here the distance covered is not given in spatial terms but in terms of the time taken to cover the distance. This is a perfective concept and it is appropriately signalled by the use of the prefix no-. The contrast here is between a limited action (in terms of time) and actions which do not have any specific limitation. This interpretation is totally at variance with that put forward by the two Bulgarian informants.

5.712. Before further analysing such idiosyncratic versions let us consider a further example of the Bulgarian use of the imperfective aorist: again the use of the imperfective is conditioned by the duration of the action. Cf. Q 17: (B2) Učiteljat govori polovin čas za naj-novite postizhenija v tehnologijata. Posle toj objasni edna-dve ot trudnostite, sreštnati v poslednoto upražnenie. As in Q 10 both govori and objasni are aorist, forming successive steps in a narrative sequence. Yet govori is imperfective and objasni is perfective. The reason for the choice of the imperfective aorist in the case of the first verb is the same as in Q 10. The action expressed by govori is durative, but the duration of the action is specifically limited by the phrase polovin čas 'half an hour'. The action of objasni on the other hand is not marked as durative.

5.713. The Lithuanian informants in this instance show no great divergence among themselves, nor do they differ from the Bulgarian in choice of aspect. Cf L 1: Mokštojas per pusę valandos kalbėjo

apie veliausius pasiekimus technologijoje; poto paaiškino vieną ar du sunkumus, kurie iškilę paskutiniuose pratimuose. Let us ignore for the moment the third verb in the L version corresponding to the B participle sreštnati. This verb does not form part of the narrative sequence since it occurs in a dependent clause.

If we take the verbs in succession we find an imperfective preterite kalbėja. Like the B form govori this verb is durative, the limiting phrase being per pusę valandos 'half an hour'. The second verb paaiškino is not durative and is consequently perfective. L 2 use išaiškino but the difference of the prefix here is not of great significance since the verbs paaiškinti and išaiškinti are virtual synonyms.

5.714. The Latvian versions show the same aspectual contrasts that are to be found in both the L and B versions. Cf La 5: Skolotāja rādāja (stāstīja) pusstundu par jaunākiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam viņš izskaidroja dažas neskaidrības pēdējā vingrinājumā. The only fluctuation that occurs among the various versions is between paskaidroja (La 3) and izskaidroja (La 1, 2, 4 and 5). Again the differences between the forms is minimal, or rather they possess a high degree of identity over most of the range of meaning.

In the La version we can see the same processes operating as in the L and B versions. The choice of imperfective or perfective aspect has been conditioned by the presence or absence of duration.

5.715. The verb in the dependent clause 'which had appeared in the last exercise' is rendered as a perfective preterite by

three of the Lithuanian informants (L 2 uses a passive construction here). The B version as we have seen do not use a finite verb but the participle sreštnati. In the versions of La 1 and 5 no vb is present; La 2 and La 4 use the perfective pluperfect: (La 2) ... kas bij atgadijušas pėdēja rakstdarbā; (La 4) ... kas bija parādījušas pėdēja uzdevumā. La 3 on the other hand also uses the pluperfect but this time it is in the imperfective: Kuri bija radušies.

5.72. The interrelationship of tense and aspect in Bulgarian shows the systematisation of these two phenomena. On one level we have an opposition which permeates a whole verbal paradigm, i.e. aspect. On the other level aorist (and in some instances perfect, of B 1's answer to Q 5) is opposed to imperfect. Theoretically the aorist and the imperfect may appear in either aspect but this theoretical picture has become distorted by the tendency (at present only a tendency) to form imperfects only from the imperfective stems of prefixed verbs.

The tense alterations may be briefly described as follows: the functional role of the aorist is to express the moments of a narrative sequence. The aorist does not usually show duration, hence its association with the perfective aspect. When duration, however limited, is implied the imperfective aorist is used.

5.721. The Baltic preterite is used in all cases where the aorist occurs in Bulgarian. Again Latvian shows a tendency to use the perfect in place of the preterite. Lithuanian too may use the perfect for the preterite but the usage is less frequent than in

the other East Baltic language.

5.722. It is when we come to consider the interrelationship of aspect and tense that the picture becomes more complicated. The complications arise from the tendencies which are inherent in the Baltic verbal system. In examples where concrete actions are concerned the response of Baltic is similar to that of Bulgarian. Cf Q 16: They came out together from the cinema, which was showing the latest French film.: L 4: Jie kartu išėjo iš kino, kuris rodė paskutinį prancūzišką filmą. All L versions agree in expressing 'They came out together...' by a perfective preterite. The second verb 'was showing' is imperfective since there is no limit imposed on the act of showing. This action has been going on before the moment when 'They came out...' and is likely to continue to be shown after this event has finished. L 2 also has rodė while L 1 and L 3 use the participial forms rodoma (L 1) and buvo rodoma (L 3).

The Latvian versions show a preponderance in favour of the perfective preterite. Cf La 5: Viņi kopā iznāca no kinozāles, kurā rādīja jaunāko franču filmu. La 2 and 3 agree with La 5 in using iznāca; La 1 differs slightly from the above: Viņi atstāja kino režīzē,... Only La 4 has the imperfective: Viņi kopā nāca ārā no kino,... The use of the analytical here does not infringe Latvian norms where there is a tendency to use the imperfective to emphasise an action.

There is almost general agreement on the use of the imperfective for the verb in the second part of the sentence. In the matter of tense, however, we find more fluctuation. La 4, for instance,

uses the pluperfect: 'kas bi ja rādījis pēdējo franču filmu'. La 2 uses the passive: kur tika rādīta jaunākā franču filma. La 3 has the following version: kurā demonstreja jaunāko franču filmu. The differences between these versions is not significant: all regard the action as a process which has not finished at the time of speaking. Even the use of the pluperfect merely sets back in time the period when this action was happening. The exception to the above is La 1 who uses the apparently perfective form izrādīja; It is possible to explain this exception since the verb izrādīt possesses the specific meaning of 'to perform, to represent, to show'. The vb izrādīt is a separate lexeme from rādīt, and, since izrādīt has no equivalent form in the analytical construction izrādīja is here functionally imperfective.

5.7221. A comparison with the Bulgarian version shows the same distribution of aspect: perfective for the first vb and imperfective for the second. Cf B 2 : Te izljazoha zaedno ot kinoto, v koeto davaha naj-novi ja frenski film. The tense of the first vb izljazoha is aorist and requires no comment. The form davaha, however, is not aor but imperfect. The B usage here differs from the usage of Lithuanian and Latvian, but as we found (see above 5.52) Bulgarian uses the imperfect tense to describe actions which are processes of unspecified duration. Moreover the vb here is not part of the narrative sequence but is part of the background.

5.723. Q 19 is another example where one would expect agreement between Bulgarian and the Baltic languages. Cf. 'Suddenly she

came into the room. In an utterance of this type the perfective aspect is alone possible, and this is what we find. Such is the measure of agreement among all the informants that it will suffice to give one example of each language. Cf. first L 1: Staiga ji iējo i kambari. La 2: Viņa pēkšņi (negaidīti) ienāca istabā. And finally the Bulgarian, (B 1): Izvednaž tja vleze v stajata. It is in utterances of this type that we obtain the highest measure of agreement and it would be instructive to see which factors are present here which are not present in the other types of utterance. Firstly we are concerned with a sudden or unexpected action. Secondly (and this also the case in Q 16) the vb describes a concrete action: the greater the degree of abstraction of the verbal lexeme the greater the likelihood that the Baltic vb will use one form for both aspects. This is less true of Lithuanian than of Latvian, where the suffixes -inėti and -ioti are more productive than the corresponding analytical forms in Latvian.

5.80. In this chapter we have studied in some detail the interaction of aorist and imperfect in Bulgarian and the corresponding tenses in the two Baltic languages. The Bulgarian tenses are clearly contrasted in terms of function. The aorist is the tense used to describe the events in any narrative sequence. The imperfect on the other hand is the tense used to set the scene, to describe the background against which the main events in the story take place.

5.81. An opposition of this kind exists in Baltic too but

this fact is complicated by the more restricted range of meaning of the Lithuanian frequentative past or, where it occurs, the mēgt construction in Latvian. As a result the preterite has a much wider role to play in Baltic than the aorist in Bulgarian: it is substituted for the frequentative forms in those contexts where these tenses are not appropriate, and in those contexts it is equivalent to the Bulgarian imperfect.

5.82. Aspect too, as we have seen, plays a part in defining an action described by the simple tenses. The perfective is normally associated with the aorist or in Baltic with the preterite where this tense has the same functional load as the aorist. In Baltic, however, the relationship is further complicated by the existence of vbs which do not possess the formal criteria for marking aspect. The determining factor in these cases is context and not the formal criteria normally associated with this phenomenon.

Bulgarian in this respect presents a much simpler picture since aspect is always clearly marked by formal criteria. The functional role of aspect in this language - and the same may be said of Baltic - is to mark those nuances which are additional to those inherent in the respective tense forms. For instance the use of the imperfective aspect will serve to mark duration, which is not a feature of the aorist (cf Q 10). Conversely the use of the perfective with the L fp stresses that the actions are all of short duration; cf from Zemē Maitintoja: Tik retkarčiais ji pakeldavo galvę ta pačia ranka, kur laikė žirkles, nubraukdama nuo akių plaukus, giliai atsikvėpdavo... PCZM pp 6 - 7. (Only occasionally she would raise her head, and, brushing away

the hair from her eyes with the same hand in which she was holding the clippers, she would take a deep breath...) The above example also illustrates the difference between the action of the frequentative past and the simple past; here laiké is imperfective and represents a constant process which accompanies the other actions, i.e. she was holding the clippers in her hand throughout the whole operation of shearing the sheep.

5.90. In the next chapter it is proposed to summarise the questions discussed in the earlier chapters (2, 3, 4 and 5). There are in effect two questions to be answered. Firstly to find out if the Baltic languages exhibit the same aspectual polarity that we find in the Slavic languages. It may be possible in the course of the discussion to throw some light on the development of the aspectual system in Slavic. The second polarity is that of tense, the polarity between the aorist and the imperfect tenses. These tenses complement each other just as the perfective and imperfective aspects complement each other. Thirdly there is the interrelationship of tense and aspect, and finally we must discuss the possibility of influences outside Baltic on Baltic both in the earlier period and at the present day.

6.0. Conclusions.

6.1. It is convenient to begin this discussion of aspect in Baltic with a quotation from a doyen of Baltic linguistics, Alfred Senn. The quotation is taken from his article Zum Gebrauch der Aktionsarten im Litauischen (Studi Baltici, vol III, 1933) and it must be noted that this was a view that Senn expressed in 1933, and cannot be held to represent the view he holds today. Nevertheless it provides a useful point of departure. Cf. pp 85-6.

"In der historischen Entwicklung des Litauischen zeigt sich als einer der mächtigsten Faktoren eine starke Neigung zum Schematisieren, besonders aber zu polarer Anordnung der Sprachformen⁴ (refers to footnote in Senn's text). Der Tendenz zu schematisieren verdankt die Sprache u. a. die Vereinfachung der Steigerung des Adjektivs... Dem Trieb nach polarer Anordnung entsprang auch ein auf die Spitze getriebenes System des Aktionsarten. Die Regel, dass einfache, d.h. nicht zusammengesetzte Verba durch Verbindung mit einer Präposition perfektiv werden, würde dahin verschärft, dass überhaupt für perfektive Aktionsart Verbindung mit einer Präposition notwendig sei." Two points concerning terminology arise straightaway. Senn uses 'Aktionsart' throughout when nowadays we would use 'aspect'. In addition he uses 'Präposition' in place of 'prefix'. Despite these superficial blemishes Senn does stress the essential point in any consideration of the system, namely the existence of a strict polarity between the two members of the opposition.

6.20. The formal criteria marking aspect.

6.21. The existence of an aspect system depends on the opposition being adequately marked. Ideally the morphemes marking this opposition should have only this function. Even in Slavic the prefix can mark a change of meaning as well as a change of aspect. As an example of prefixes which mark only aspect there is na- in the R napisat' or B 'napravja; the prefixed forms correspond to simple forms - pisat' (R) and pravja (B). This is not to say that na- is exclusively a marker of aspect, but that in conjunction with the vbs (R) pisat' and (B) pravja it marks only aspect.

6.211. The prefix then has been specialised in the role of marker of the perfective aspect. This is a feature shared by Baltic and Slavic. Again in theory any prefix may play the part of aspect marker. In practice, though one may find examples of all the prefixes, certain prefixes have been specialised in this role. The commonest of these is Baltic pa- (Sl po-); cf. L padaryti (p): daryti and La padarīt (p): darīt. The simple (i) forms mean "to do" in both Baltic languages.

6.212. The markers of the perfective may also be suffixes. Here again we find common ground between Lithuanian and Slavic. The Lithuanian suffixes -telėti and -terėti serve to mark a vb as perfective; cf. žvelgti (i) 'to look': (p) žvilgterėti. This suffix which indubitably marks the root žvilg- as perfective is, however, specialised in the meaning of an action of very short duration. In respect of their degree of specialisation they recall the Slavic semelfactive suffix -ngti; cf. R stuknut' (p) stučat'. Nevertheless forms in -terėti/ -telėti are of high

productivity. Beside perfective forms in -terēti/ -telēti there are normal prefixed perfectives to the same simple form: the vb lūvelgti (i) 'to look' has pašvelgti beside lūvilgtērēti. Latvian does not use suffixation to form perfectives.

6.213. There exist in Lithuanian as in Slavic simple vbs which are perfective. Senn in his article mentioned above quotes a few of these forms: rasti to find, griebti etc. (p 86). (It is true he mentions these verbs in connection with the phenomenon of hyperperfectivisation, i.e. the prefixation and hence perfectivisation of vbs already perfective.) The Lithuanian forms are all characterised by the fact that they are of extremely short duration, what L Dambriūnas calls 'point action' vbs. These may be compared with the suffixed forms in terēti/ -telēti.

6.22. A characteristic feature of Baltic is the existence of a large class of bi-aspectual verbs. These verbs have a wide semantic range, containing on the one hand the vb L grįžti 'to return' and on the other the vbs of perception. All the above are simple verbs, the class also contains prefixed forms which either do not possess a simple form or the corresponding simple form is unconnected in meaning; cf. L dėti 'to put': (p) padėti or pradėti (n) 'to begin' (n - here neutral or bi-aspectual).

The examples cited above have all been Lithuanian but the remarks could equally well have been applied to Latvian: not surprisingly there are differences of detail. For instance, L grįžti corresponds to a prefixed form in Latvian, atgriezt (ies); it is still bi-aspectual. There is, however, a greater measure of agreement than disagreement.

6.30. Marking the imperfective.

6.31. Though it is customary to speak of the perfective as being the marked member of the opposition, the unmarked imperfective must also be clearly differentiated. To take an extreme example dat' (p) 'to give' is formally marked as perfective since it possesses a syllable less than the unmarked imperfective davat', and yet davat' is newer than dat'. In most cases the perfective form of a simple verb will be marked by the prefix; thus, R pisat' (i) but (p) napisat'.

6.32. The perfective is here unambiguous since the prefix na- has the purely grammatical function of marking perfectivity. A prefix may, however, function on two levels: 1. it functions grammatically, changing the simple imperfective vb into a perfective, and 2. the meaning of the simple verb may be changed. If instead of na- one uses the prefix o-, the compound form opisat' is a) perfective and b) a different vb from the simple form pisat'; it now means not 'to write', but 'to describe'. The creation of the form opisat' has created a new requirement: for secondary imperfectives, creating a new pair opisat' (p): opisyvat'. This new form opisyvat' shows one of the means used to create new imperfectives, the suffix -yvat'.

6.321. The Lithuanian response to this problem resembles the Slavic; the suffixes in this case are the original iteratives -inėti and -ioti. The prefixed form užrašyti 'to make a note of' (simple vb rašyti, 'to write') corresponds to užrašinėti with the

same meaning; ateiti 'to come': ateidinėti. There are restrictions on the formations of such aspectual pairs which will be analysed in a later section.

6.322. The system of imperfectivisation in Latvian differs considerably from that used in Lithuanian and Slavic in that it does not make use of such imperfectivising suffixes. The La system - the analytical construction - consists of substituting for a prefix an adverb which is identical in meaning; the adverb accompanies the simple form of the verb. Cf. iznākt (p) 'to come out': nākt ārā (or laukā); nosviest (p) 'to throw away': sviest nost.

6.330. Restrictions on the use of imperfectivising formants.

6.331. One of the essential differences between the Baltic and Slavic aspectual systems is the fact that just as not every Baltic verb may be perfectivised (a restricted number) many perfective verbs have no imperfective forms. In point of fact these verbs can and do operate in imperfective contexts and are thus distributionally imperfective but there is no overt realisation of the imperfective aspect. Others again have specifically imperfective forms but they are used much less frequently than the prefixed ostensibly perfective form. If one excludes external factors one possible reason is the existence of distinctive Aktionsarten. The iterative-intensive Aktionsart is at the basis of the two imperfectivising formants in Lithuanian -inėti and ioti; the perfectivising Aktionsarten are in the main marked by prefixes.

Thus the prefix pa- in L pamatyti 'to see' or the La paredzēt (idem) points to the shortness and suddenness of the action described. Similarly La iz- and even da- (from R do-) points to the completion of an action but stress either the thoroughness of the achievement (iz-) or the effort expended in achieving a goal, cf. iziet 'to go through' (accompanied by the adv cauri). Aktionsarten are, of course, found in Slavic but there they do not play so extensive a role in the aspect system.

6.332. Paradoxical though it may seem, the other contributory factors are the size of the bi-aspectual group and, of course, its range, which inhibited the full development in Baltic of an aspect system comparable to the Slavic. The two factors complement each other: the Lithuanian matyti is bi-aspectual and the overt realisation of aspectual polarity has been neutralised in this word. Though the L word has been used, this is merely for convenience, the La form redzēt possesses the same characteristics. A perfective form exists for matyti - pamatyti, but this form should more properly be called an Aktionsart since it stresses the shortness and suddenness of an action. The form pamatyti approximates to what Senn referred to as "hyperperfectives" since the simple form is already perfective when it occurs in perfective contexts: the pa- does not make it perfective but a special type of perfective.

6.333. Conversely one may speak of "hyperimperfectives" where there exists an imperfective (usually in -inėti) for prefixed bi-aspectual verbs. An example of this is the form atsakinėti

'to answer' beside atsakytī the normal form. In Latvian such forms as atsakinēti are not found, there is no overtly imperfective form for atsacīt (or atbildēt). This arises from a limitation on the analytical construction, which is less frequently found with abstract verbs. This is particularly true with lexemes where the simple form is not found (or is rare) or whose meaning differs considerably from that of the compound form.

6.334. Specialised imperfectives have in common with the Aktionsarten of normally paired verbs that their function is emphatic. This desire to express emphasis is characteristic of both Baltic languages. This has led at times to the selection of the imperfective in preference to the perfective in contexts which do not normally bear this interpretation. Such is an example from the La translation of Orwell's Animal Farm; here the analytical construction is used where one would normally expect the perfective: Cetri jauni barokļi priekšējā rindā laida vaļā spalgu kviecienu, tā izsacīdami savu neapmierinātību. (DzF p 47): "Four young porkers in the front row uttered shrill squeals of disapproval,..." (AF p 49). The use of laida vaļā instead of atlaida draws attention to the emphatic nature of the vb uttered. The compound form atlaida is neutral in terms of emphasis.

6.335. It is the emphatic nature of the aspectual formants (whether perfectivising or imperfectivising) which must have led to their selection for their present function. Yet side by side we find prefixes which are neutral - having only a grammatical function - and prefixes which are emphatic. The remarks made

above about prefixes may equally well be applied to the formants of imperfectivisation.

6.34. There are two ways of looking at the Baltic aspect system. Firstly one may take the view that the Baltic system first approximated to that of Slavic and then diverged along paths of its own. Secondly one may consider the Baltic system as being in an intermediate position, i.e. that it has not reached the position already attained by Slavic in the OCS period. The material studied tends indeed to suggest that the second conclusion is the right one. The factors leading to this conclusion are respectively: the existence of many bi-aspectual verbs, the characteristic polysemy of the perfectivising prefixes and the retention of emphatic nuances by the formants of imperfectivisation. All these factors taken together tend to suggest the incomplete realisation of the aspectual polarity. There is still a very great element of personal choice in the aspectual decisions made by Baltic speakers and writers.

6.40. The problem of influence.

6.41. It is intended here to put forward only some very tentative suggestions. That the Balts were exposed to influence from outside Baltic is not really in doubt, but the evidence for influence is mainly to be found in the domain of lexis. Cf L dial ale 'but' (from Polish), La un 'and' from Ger und; L knyga 'book' from R kniga (or possibly White Russian). The reason the Latvians adopted the German und is fairly clear: it avoided the homonymy of La ir 'and' from CBalt ir and ir from CBalt īrā (cf. L yra) 'is/are'.

6.42. The few loan words cited above show clearly the principal directions from which influence has come. In the case of Lithuanian it was indubitably Slavic, whether Polish during the period of the Lituan-Polish Jagellonian dynasty (1386 - 1572) or WR both before and during the above period. Latvian on the contrary has been strongly influence by German.

6.421. The influence of Slavic on Baltic is more likely to have impinged on Lithuanian with its long association with Slavic speakers: from this long association must have arisen a period of bi-lingualism which occurred at several levels. The influences on Latvian were predominantly German dating from the founding of the German bishopric in Riga in the 13th century (Riga itself was founded in 1201) Despite the fact that the influences were so diverse the two languages have much in common. Both share the concept that prefixes perfectivise. They differ not in recognising the concept of the imperfective but in the means used to differentiate this aspect from the perfective. This fact tends to suggest that such influence as there has been - at least in respect of the major grammatical features - has been marginal.

6.43. The development of the Baltic aspect system exhibits three chronological stages (i.e. in relative terms). Prefixation is an inherited feature of which there is ample documentation in the other IE languages. It is possible that the use of prefixation as a means of distinguishing the Aktionsarten is also an early feature of Baltic: examples of this feature are also to be found in Germanic, e.g. ge- which originally had only

emphatic value (cf Senn, op cit, p 86). This first stage can still be called Common E Baltic since it is shared by Latvian. The second stage is the use of prefixes to mark the perfective aspect and not merely Aktionsarten. This stage is also common to Latvian and Lithuanian.

The third and final stage is when other formants are used to differentiate the imperfective. Here the means used to achieve this end differ. Lithuanian uses suffixation while Latvian uses separable adverbial elements. The use of the analytical construction by Latvian rather than suffixation - the means adopted by Lithuanian and Slavic - is evidence of the separate development of this construction. At this period Latvian and Lithuanian must be considered separate languages. One can no longer speak of Common East Baltic.

It was suggested in chapter 3 that Latvian rejected suffixation as an imperfectivising formant on account of the lack of distinctiveness that existed within the stock of derivational suffixes. The phonological process which led to the lack of distinctiveness of certain suffixes inherited from Common Baltic can be tentatively dated to the 13th - 14th centuries. At this time the group 'vowel plus nasal plus consonant' became 'oral vowel plus consonant'. It is suggested that it was at this period that the Baltic languages began to develop separate imperfective forms for prefixed verbs. Unfortunately the Balts were still in what has been referred to elsewhere as the pre-literate period. Since there are no written documents for this period we will never have any definite proof. All that one can say is that the third stage was considerably later than the first and second stages.

6.50. The tense opposition in Baltic.

6.51. The tense opposition that one finds in Lithuanian between the preterite and the frequentative past cannot be Common Baltic. The only simple past tense that can with confidence be assigned to the Common Baltic period is the preterite. In this respect one can take Latvian as being more typical of Common Baltic. Despite the considerable modifications that have taken place as a result of the phonological process cited above (p 174) the Latvian verb is more conservative than the Lithuanian.

6.52. The frequentative past is a separate development of Lithuanian. As the name suggests its functional load embraces the following modes of action: frequentative-habitual and frequentative-intensive. It is also characterised by a high frequency of occurrence, unlike the Latvian equivalent. At 5.40 et seq we examined the possibility that a similar role might exist for the La construction of megt followed by a dependent infinitive. In terms of function this construction could have filled the role to which it was to have been assigned it suffered from one serious disadvantage, of with the L fp its frequency was low both in the literature and in the replies of the informants.

6.53. Like the Lithuanian forms in davo this construction is the result of independent development. It was superficially attractive because it conformed to the tendency of Latvian to rely on analytical rather than synthetic modes. This is paralleled elsewhere by the use of the analytical construction to make the

imperfective of prefixed verbs where the prefix is not a purely formal one but indicates a change of meaning. (see further chap 3). Despite the factors in its favour its low productivity meant that it could not provide an effective opposition to the preterite. It was noted that all informants used it at least once but the distribution indicated that it possessed an emphatic value rather than a grammatical one.

6.53. The L forms in -davo cover the same range of meaning as the La forms, but they appear very frequently both in the literature studied and also in the replies of the informants. Unlike the La forms they are fully grammaticalised.

6.54. Both the La and L forms were compared with the B imperfect and it was found that the B imperfect also appeared in frequentative-habitual and frequentative-intensive contexts. Its ultimate range of meaning, however, was much wider than the Baltic tenses (if one may use this word for the La construction), and, for this reason its frequency exceeded that of Lithuanian. Like the L tense it could appear in either aspect though with different nuances of meaning according to aspect.

6.55. The Baltic imperfect and the corresponding Baltic tenses are excluded when it is a question of an event in a narrative sequence, since they are confined to a dependent role. The role of marking events in a narrative sequence belongs to the aorist in Bulgarian. In the Baltic languages on the other hand the preterite may appear in either role, i.e. it may equate with B aor

or imperfect. This duality of role originates in the fact that the preterite replaces the frequentative tenses (or constructiona) where these are excluded on account of their restricted range of meaning.

6.56. The Baltic tense opposition (here we are speaking mainly of Lithuanian) resembles the aspectual opposition in these languages in that the opposition has been incompletely realised in grammatical terms (i.e. the preterite is still used suppletively where these forms are inappropriate). Moreover the emphatic nature of the formants marking these tenses is still felt by the users.

6.561. Some light may be shed on the status of the fp in Lithuanian if one considers that the Lithuanian literary language is still a fairly recent creation. The early documents in Lithuanian (from the end of the 16th century) do not represent a standard language but are orientated to the dialect of the writer. The literary language as we know it is an amalgam of the two main language groups, Zemaičiai and Aukštaičiai. The frequentative past is a feature of Aukštaičiai and is absent from Zemaičiai.

6.6. The picture presented by the Slavic languages is of a series of oppositions which appear to operate automatically. Thus for every simple vb there exists a perfective verb (prefixed). Where prefixes change the meaning of a simple verb as well as changing its aspect a new imperfective is created by suffixation. The aspect system has been fully grammaticalised. In Baltic

on the other hand grammaticalisation has not been attained to this extent. Many of the formants used, whether suffixal or free forms, are still imbued with the emphatic character they possessed when they served as markers of Aktionsarten rather than aspect. The situation of the Baltic groups is not to be regarded as innovatory but rather as an intermediate stage. The failure of the Baltic languages to reach the Slavic stage of development is not to be ascribed to a lack of the appropriate derivational apparatus, but rather to their slow development.

6.61. As literary languages they originated in the nineteenth century and here again they faced opposition on the unofficial and the official level, and it is the latter that is more significant. To communicate outside the Baltic area a second language was essential (according to area this would be either Russian, Polish or German). It is of interest in this connection that the greatest Polish poet of the nineteenth century, Adam Mickiewicz, was born in what is now called Vilnius,⁶¹ the capital of the Lithuanian Socialist Soviet Republic. The use of a second language as a lingua franca has always inhibited the growth of vernacular into a literary language (cf. the effects of the use of Latin in Poland).

6.62. The situation of the Baltic languages contrasts unfavourably with that of Slavic, where one can observe a steady development from the Xth century. Moreover the language at this date already

61. The opening line of Pan Tadeusz is: 'Litwo ojczyzna moja...' 'Lithuania, my native land'.

possessed an aspectual system and a fully developed temporal opposition. Thereafter the development of the individual Slavic languages was uneven. Most have lost or are in the process of losing the simple past tenses, but the aspectual opposition still remains. This opposition is between original perfects - other compound tenses (future perfect, conditional perfect and pluperfect) are rare or have disappeared. The most advanced in this respect are the E. Slavic languages. West Slavic still retains the pluperfect, though it is rare; Polish has also innovated in creating a series of personal endings for the past tense.

6.621. Perhaps the fundamental difference separating Slavic from E and W Slavic lies in the retention in S. Slavic of a form that has purely future significance. For instance, the present tense in the imperfective aspect in E and W Slavic functions as a future in the perfective. The S Slavic future is only future (with the corollary that the present functions as a present in the p aspect). Similarly the S. Slavic future is derived in the main from OCS xotěti to want (with the exception of the neg futures in B and M). With regard to the temporal oppositions within the simple past this feature of OCS has been totally lost in Slovene and is less and less used in spoken SCr. Only Bulgarian and Macedonian have preserved this opposition. Except for their retention of this OCS opposition the B and M systems are essentially innovatory. Though highly sophisticated, their systems do not resemble closely the OCS system. Perhaps the greater part of their complexity is to be traced to the renarrative system of tenses. It cannot be said that they have retained the

OCS future perfect since the means used to mark this tense are new creations.

6.622. Curious though it may seem, the Baltic tense system resembles most that found in B and M. Baltic possesses a separate future formant (the suffix -s-, originally desiderative, cf also Gk and Skt). Consequently the present may be found in either aspect. The Baltic relative mood corresponds to the B and M renarrative system. This mood is most strongly developed in Latvian. It will be seen that unevenness of development is characteristic of Baltic as of Slavic. Latvian has a highly developed relative mood while on the other hand Lithuanian has developed the opposition between two simple past tenses.

6.623. The similarities between B and M and the two Baltic languages are, of course, typological since neither can be said to have influenced the other. Moreover the inherited features are not the same in both groups: e.g. the Baltic future in -s- is an inherited feature, the S Slavic future forms are innovating. The L and La presents have all been normalised on the basis of the thematic type (curiously enough the La 1P sg of the vb to be, esmu is a hybridisation of the two types of present). Traces of the athematic type are much more strongly represented in Slavic.

6.624. It is possible to regard the creation of the fp in Lithuanian as the result of what archeologists have called stimulus diffusion, i.e. that the idea of a tense opposition was borrowed,

but not the forms. The only source from which this idea could have come is the Slavic peoples in close contact with the Lithuanians, i.e. the WR or the Poles. Yet by the fourteenth century this tense opposition was giving way to the perfect. Two possible solutions may be posited: 1) the idea of a tense opposition was borrowed much earlier, or 2) we must come back to the notion that it was an independent development of the Aukštaičiai dialect of Lithuanian.

6.625. The elements going to make up the L fp are all clearly explicable in Baltic terms (for a detailed description see Christian Stang, Das slavische und baltische Verbum, p 172 et seq) but it is their use in combination that can be described as innovating. Despite its conservatism in the substantival declension Lithuanian is not averse to innovation and it would not be beyond the bounds of possibility that the fp should be an independent invention of Lithuanian.

6.626. The picture presented by Latvian is somewhat different. Latvian has tended rather to react to changes resulting from phonological processes. These processes were in all probability brought about by the interaction between Baltic speakers and a non-Baltic (Finnic) substratum. The one change which may without doubt be ascribed to this substratum is the shift of the stress accent onto the first syllable (a Finno-Ugrian feature). This shift of stress brought about further changes: the contraction of final vowels in many cases: of the locatives -ē, -ī and -ū. These locatives can be compared with the L forms -éje, -yje, -uje.

None of these changes can be described as innovating, though the term may be applied to the analogical extension of f loc sg -ā (L -oje) to the masc o-stems (L -e). In this respect then Latvian may be looked on as more conservative than Lithuanian in that it does not so readily resort to innovation.

6.627. Where it is a question of the tense opposition the situation in Latvian may be considered the Baltic norm: i.e. no true tense opposition existed. The use of the mēgt construction is still too sporadic in its distribution to be considered a true opposition. Here Lithuanian innovates. In the case of aspect too the Lithuanian suffixed imperfectives -inėti and ioti are less restricted in their distribution than the La analytical construction.

6.70. Final remarks.

6.71. A typological comparison shows that the Baltic languages are essentially of the aspectual type rather than the type found in Western Europe, where the opposition is between anteriority and non-anteriority. The aspectual nature of the Baltic languages is to a certain extent concealed by the presence of an elaborate tense system. That this point is not significant is proved by the even more elaborate tense system of Bulgarian which we have used as our model in the latter part of this work.

6.72. The aspectual system of Baltic is less evolved than that of Slavic, which points to the slower development of the Baltic

system. Both the Slavic and the Baltic aspect systems are innovative: they differ from the aspectual system attributed to IE, which distinguished between verbal bases. Both Baltic and Slavic use prefixes to mark the perfective. Lithuanian, like Slavic, uses suffixes to mark new imperfectives. Latvian differs here in using adverbial elements (the analytic construction).

6.73. Lithuanian has in the suffix -davo the beginnings of a tense opposition comparable to the B opposition between the aor and the imperfect. The L fp resembles the La construction (māgt and dependent infin) in its range of meaning and is therefore more restricted in its distribution than the B imperfect. Nevertheless they (the B and L tenses) have in common the fact that they can be used in either aspect, though with a preference (particularly in modern B) for the imperfective.

6.74. The tense with the heaviest functional load in the Baltic languages is the preterite. It corresponds at times to both the B aor and B imperfect. In the latter case the B imperfect has neither a frequentative-habitual or a frequentative-intensive function. The tendency exists in all three languages for the perfect to act suppletively for the preterite (or aor in B). This tendency is more highly developed in Latvian than in either L or B.

6.75. Comparisons between Baltic and Slavic tend to suggest that Baltic occupies an intermediate position. The two languages in question have neither attained the regularity of modern

Bulgarian or Macedonian in the two oppositions mentioned - p: i and aor: imp - nor have they eliminated the simple past tenses (and reduced the number of compound tenses) and constructed a purely aspectual opposition. What will be the result of the intensification of the influence of Russian which has been a feature of the last twenty-five years is a matter for speculation, and it is too early yet to express any definite opinions on this matter.

Appendices.

A

Questionnaire on the use of tense and aspect:

1. Every year they used to travel to Europe to visit friends.
2. The farmer drove into market regularly; there he bought what he needed and sold his produce. Once a year he sold a bull.
3. Few came to the meeting though many invitations were sent out.
4. The ground outside was covered with snow. In places it was so deep that only a tractor could get through.
5. "What has happened?" he asked. "Nobody knows", replied the bystanders.
6. It has been reliably reported that all the crew of the aircraft that crashed survived.
7. We heard he came back on Thursday.
8. He began to speak but after the first five minutes he was constantly interrupted.
9. The silence was interrupted by a shot. Somebody had, no doubt been firing at a wolf.

10. He continued on his way and walked for two hours. In all this time he saw only two people.
11. The gamekeeper picked up the burnt rags and believed he had found the cause of the recent fire.
12. "What have I done?" he exclaimed, when he saw the floor all covered with water.
13. He handed over a book to each of the children; every birthday they used to receive a new book.
14. John was never able to discover who had left the letter, - it had obviously not come through the post.
15. "It has started", the people shouted when the earth began to tremble.
16. They came out together from the cinema, which was showing the latest French film.
17. The teacher spoke for half an hour about the latest achievements in technology; then he explained one or two difficulties which had appeared in the last exercise.
18. They were abruptly told to run away and amuse themselves elsewhere.
19. Suddenly she came into the room.

20. "Did you come home every week?"
 21. I took a newspaper from the shelf and opened it at the middle page.
 22. The door shut and she heard somebody coming upstairs.
 23. The shop door was constantly opening and shutting.
 24. He ran down to the gate to let them in.
 25. He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.
 26. He had spent most of his life abroad. At the age of fifty he suddenly decided to come home.
 27. He always wrote to his parents when he was away from home.
 28. He threw the logs onto the fire which soon burnt more brightly. Then from time to time he would throw another log on to keep the fire in.
 29. The train stopped and the two brothers went out into the village street. They usually went out at about this time.
 30. He caught sight of her momentarily at the train window.
-

Replies to the questionnaire:

L 1:

1. Kiekvienais metais jis važiuodavo į Europą aplankyti draugų.
2. Ūkininkas pastoviai važiuodavo į turgų; ten jis pirkdavo kas jam reikalinga ir pardavdavo savo gaminius. Vieną kartą į metus jis parkuodavo jautį.
3. Mažai atėjo į susirinkimą, nors kvietimų buvo išsiųsta daug.
4. Lauke žemė buvo padengta sniegu. Vietomis ji buvo taip giliai, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.
5. "Kas atsitiko?" jis paklausė. "Niekas nežino", atsakė šalia stovintieji.
6. Patikimai buvo pranešta, kad visa nukritusiojo lėktuvo įgula liko gyva.
7. Mes girdėjome, kad jis grįžo ketvirtadienį.
8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, bet po pirmųjų penkių minučių buvo nuolatos pertraukiamas.
9. Tyliuma buvo šūvio pertraukta. Be abejonės kažkas šaudė į vilką.

10. Jis tęsė savo kelionę ir ėjo dvi valandas. Per visą tą laiką jis matė tik du žmones.
11. Bigulys pakėlė sudegusius škurlius ir galvojo, kad surado paskutiniojo gaisro priežastį.
12. "Ką aš padariau?" jis sušuko, kai pamatė visas grindis apsemtas vandeniu.
13. Jis įteikė knygą kiekvienam vaikui; kiekvieną gimtadienį jie gaudavo po naują knygą.
14. Jonas niekuomet nesužinojo, kas paliko laišką - jis nebuvo siųstas per paštą.
15. "Prasidėjo", šaukė žmonės, kai žemė pradėjo drebėti.
16. Jis kartu išėjo iš kino, kuriame buvo rodoma naujausia Prancūziška filmas.
17. Mokytojas per pusę valandos kalbėjo apie vėliausius pasiekimus technologijoje; po to pasiškino vieną ar du sunkumus, kurie iškilę paskutiniuose pratinimuose.
18. Staiga jiems buvo pasakyta bėgti ir linksmintis kur nors kitur.
19. Staiga ji įėjo į kambarį.

20. "Ar tu eini namo kiekvieną savaitę.
21. Aš paėmiau laikraštį nuo lentynos ir atskleidžiau vidurinį puslapį.
22. Durys užsidarė ir ji išgirdo kažką lipant laiptais aukštyn.
23. Krautuvės durys visą laiką atsidarinėjo ir užsidarinėjo.
24. Jis nubėgo prie vartų juos įleisti.
25. Jis bėgiojo iš vienos vietos į kitą, dirbdamas šį bei tą.
26. Jis praleido didesnę savo gyvenimo dalį užsienyje. Sulaukęs penkiasdešimt metų jis staiga nutarė grįžti namo.
27. Jis visuomet rašydavo savo tėvams, kada jis būdavo išvykęs iš namų.
28. Jis užmetė malkų ant ugnies, kurie greitai degė šviesiai. Po to laikas nuo laika jis užmesdavo pagalį, kad palaikius ugnį degant.
29. Lietus sustojo/nustojo ir du broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Jie paprastai išeidavo apie tą laiką.
30. Jis pamatė ją akymirksniui traukinio lange.

L 2.

1. Kiekvienais metais jie keliaudavo į Europą lankyti draugų.
2. Ūkininkas vis nuvažiuodavo į turgų; ten jis nusipirkdavo, ko jam reikia, ir parkuodavo savo gaminius. Kartą per metus jis parduodavo bulių.
3. Į susitinkimą teatėjo tik keletas, nors daug pakvietimų buvo išsiuntinėta.
4. Žemė lauke buvo apklota sniegu. Vietomis jis buvo toks gilus, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.
5. "Kas atsitiko?" paklausė jis. "Niekas nežino," atsakė besidairantieji.
6. Kaip tikrąs dalykas buvo pranešta, kad išliko gyva visa įgula to lėktuvo, kuris sudužo.
7. Girdėjome, kad jis grįžo ketvirtadienį.
8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, bet po pirmųjų penkių minučių jis jau nuolat buvo pertaukinėjamas.
9. Tylą nutraukė šūvis. Matyt, kažkas bus šovęs į vilką.
10. Jis toliau tęsė savo kelionę dvejetą valandų. Per visą tą laiką jis tematė tik du žmones.

11. Girininkas pakėlė apdegusiuosius skudurus ir patikėjo, kad jis bus suradęs paskutiniojo gaisro priežastį.
12. "Ką aš padariau?" sušuko jis, pamatęs, kad visos grindys pilnos vandens.
13. Jis davinėjo kiekvienam vaikui po knygą; Kiekvieną gimtadienį jie paprastai gaudavo po naują knygą.
14. Jonas niekada nepajėgė išsiaiškinti, kas paliko laišką; aišku, kad jis ne paštu atėjo.
15. "Prasidėjo," šaukė žmonės, kai žemė pradėjo drebėti.
16. Jie kartu išėjo iš kinoteatro, kuris rodė naują prancūzišką filmą.
17. Mokytojas pusvalandį kalbėjo apie naujausius technologijos pasiekimus; paskui jis išaiškino vieną kitą klintį, su kuria susidurta paskutiniajame pratime.
18. Staiga jiems buvo pasakyta bėgti šalin ir kur kitur susirasti juokų.
19. Staiga ji įėjo į kombarį.
20. "Ar tu kas savaitę pareidinėjai namo?"

21. Pasiėmiau nuo lentynos laikraštį ir atverčiau jį ties viduriniais puslapiais.
22. Užsidarė durys ir ji išgirdo, kad kažkas ateina laiptais (... išgirdo kažką ateinant laiptais.)
23. Parduotuvės durys buvo nuolat atidarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos.
24. Jis pabėgėgo (nubėgo) iki vartų ir įlėido juos.
25. Jis bėginėjo pirmyn ir atgal, čia žiuo, čia tuo užsiimdamas.
26. Didžiąją savo gyvenimo dalį jis buvo praleidęs svetur. Sulaukęs penkiasdešimt staiga nusprendė grįžti namo.
27. Jis visada rašė tėvams, kai būdavo išvažiavęs.
28. Jis metė rastigalius į ugnį, kuri netrukus sviesiau suliepsnojo... (omitted).
29. Nustojo lyti, ir abu broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Paprastai jie visada apie tokį laiką išeidavo.
30. Jis akimirksniui sugavo jos žvilgsnį prie traukinio lango.

L 3.

1. Kasmēt jie važiuodavo į Europą aplankyti draugų.
2. Ūkininkas reguliariai važiuodavo į turgų; čia jis pirkdavo kas jam reikalinga ir pardudavo savo gaminius. Kartą metuose jis pardudavo bulių.
3. Mažai atsilankė į susirinkimą, nors buvo išsiuntinėta daugelis pakvietimų.
4. Lauke žemė buvo nuklota sneigu. Vietomis buvo taip gilų, kad tik traktorus buvo galima pravažiuoti.
5. "Kas atsitiko?" jis paklausė. "Niekas nežino", atsakė šalia stovintieji.
6. Pagal patikimus šaltinius buvo pranešta, kad visa nukritusio lėktuvo įgula išsigelbėjo.
7. Mes girdėjome, kad jis sugrįžo devyrtadienį.
8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, bet jau po pirmųjų minučių buvo nuolatos pertraukiamas.
9. Tyla buvo pertraukta šūvio. Be abejo, kažkas šovė į vilką.
10. Beeidamas savo keliu jis vaikščiojo dvi valandas. Per tą laiką jis tematė tik du žmones.

11. Eigulys pakėlė nuo žemės apdegusiusius skudurus ir tikėjo, kad atrado neperseniausiai įvykusioje gaisro priežastį.
12. "Ką gi aš padariau?" sušuko jis, kai pamatė kad ant grindų yra pilna vandens.
13. Jis įteikė po knygą kiekvienam vaikui; kiekvieno gimtadienio proga jie gaudavo po knygą.
14. Jonui niekad nepasisekė išaiškinti kas paliko laišką; be abejo, jis nebuvo siųstas paštu.
15. "Jau prasidėjo", šaukė žmonės, kai žemė ėmė drebėti.
16. Jie kartu išėjo iš kino, kuriame rodoma paskutinis Prancūziškas filmas. (filma and filmas are both found)
17. Moktojas kalbėjo pusę valandos apie naujausius technologijas atsiekimus; tuomet jis paaikšino vieną kitą sunkumą, kuris iškilo paskutiniajame uždavinyje.
18. Jiems staiga buvo pasakyta bėgti ir linksmintis kitur.
19. Staiga, jinai įėjo į kambarį.
20. "Ar tu grįždavai namo kas savaitę?"

21. Aš paėmiau laikraštį nuo lentynos ir atverčiau vidurinį puslapį.
22. Duris užsidarė or ji girdėjo kažką lipant laiptais į viršų.
23. Krautuvės duris nuolatos buvo atdarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos.
24. Jis nubėgo prie verty ir įleido juos vidun.
25. Jis lakstė šen ir ten, vis užsiimdamas save tai su šiuo, tai su tuo.
26. Beveik visą savo gyvenimą jis praleido užsienyje. Sulaukęs penkiasdešimt metų, staiga jis nutarė sugrįžti namo.
27. Jis visuomet rašydavo tėvams, dai būdavo išvažiavęs. iš namų.
28. Jis įmetė rąstus į ugnį, kuri tuojuo ėmė sparčiau degti. Vėliau, kartas nuo karto, jis vis įmesdavo po rąstą, kad ugnis neišblėstų.
29. Nustojo lyti ir du broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Pa prastai jie visuomet maždaug šiuo laiku išeidavo lauk.
30. Jis akimirksniui pamatė jį traukinio lange.

L 4.

1. Kiekvienais metais jie keliavo į Europą aplankyti draugų.
 2. Ūkininkas į turgų važiavo reguliariai/ važinėdavo pastoviai;
jis ten nusipirkdavo ko reikėjo, ir pardavdavo savo gaminius.
Kartą metuose jis pardavdavo jautį.
 3. Mažai atvyko į susirinkimą, nors buvo išsiųsta daug pakvietimų.
 4. Žemė lauke buvo apsnigusi. Vietomis sniegas buvo toks
gilus, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.
- OR
- Žemė lauke buvo apdengta sniego. Vietomis jis buvo toks
gilus, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.
5. "Kas atsitiko?" jis paklausė. "Niekas nežino", atsakė
stovintieji.
 6. Patikimi šaltiniai pranešė, kad visa sudužusiojo lėktuvo
įgula išsigelbėjo.
 7. Girdėjome, kad jis grįžo ketvirtadienį.
 8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, tačiau po pirmųjų penkių, minučių
jis buvo nuolatos pertraukinėjamas.
 9. Tylą pertraukė šūvis. kažkas, tur būt, šovė į vilką.

10. Jis ėjo savo keliu ir žingsniavo dvi valandas. Per visą tą laiką jis temė tik du žmones.
11. Žvėrininkas pakėlė apdegusiuosius skudurus ir tikėjosi radęs neseniai buvusiojo gaisro priežastį.
12. "Ką aš padariau?" jis sušuko, pamatęs visas grindis apsemtas vandeniu.
13. Kiekvienam vaikui jis padavė po knygą; kiekvieną gimtadienį jie gaudavo po naują knygą.
14. Jonas niekada negalėjo sužinoti, kas paiko laišką - buvo aišku, kad jis neatėjo paštu.
15. "Prasidėjo", šaukė žmonės, kai žemė pradėjo drebėti.
16. Jie kartu išėjo iš kino, kuris rodė paskutinį prancūzišką filmą.
17. Mokytojas pusė valandos pasakojo apie paskutiniausius technologijos laimėjimus; po to jis paašškino vieną kitą sunkumą, kurie pasitaikė paskutiniajame pratime.
18. Jiems griežtai liepė dingti ir žaisti kur kitur.

OR

Jiems griežtai liepė bėgti ir susirasti pramogų kur nors kitur.

19. Staiga ji įėjo į kambarį.
20. Ar grįždavai namo kiekvieną savaitę?
21. Nuo lentynos pasiėmiau laikraštį ir atsiverčiau ties viduriniuoju puslapiu.
22. Duryš užsidarė, ir ji girdėjo kažką lipant laiptais.
23. Parduotuvės duryš visą laiką buvo atidarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos.
24. Jis nubėgo prie verty ir juos įleido.
25. Jis lankstė šen ir ten, kartais užsiiminėjo šiuo, kartais tuo.
26. Didžiausią savo gyvenimo dalį, jis praleido užsieniuose. Sulaukęs penkiasdešimties, jis staiga nutarė grįžti namo.
27. Jis visuomet rašinėdavo tėvams, kai būdavo išvykęs iš namų.
28. Jis sumetė rąstus į ugnį, kuri bematant suliepsnojo skaidriau. Po to jis retkarčiais įmesdavo po rąstą liepsnai palaikyti.
29. Nustojo lyti, ir abu broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Apie šį laiką jie paprastai išeidavo lauk.
30. Jis ją pamatė akimirksniui traukinio lange.

La 1.

1. Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apmeklētu draugus.
2. Saimnieks brauca uz tirgu regulāri; tur viņš pirka ko viņam vajadzēja un pārdeva savus ražojumus. Reizi gadā viņš pārdeva pa bullim (vērsim).
3. Nečandzīl apmeklēja sanākami, kaut gan bij izsūtīti ielūgumu.
4. Zemi laukā klāja sniegs. Vietām tas bij tik dziļš, ka tikai traktors varēja tikt cauri.
5. "Kas noticis?" viņš jautāja. "Neviens nezina," atbildēja klātesošie.
6. Bij ticamas ziņas, ka visa avarējušās lidmašīnas apkalpe ir izglābusies.
7. Mes dzirdējām, ka viņš esot atgriezies ceturdieni.
8. Viņš iesāka runāt, bet pēc pirmajām piecām minūtēm viņu nepārtraukti pārtrauca.
9. Klusumu iztraucēja šāviens. Kāds, bez šaubām, šāva vilku.
10. Viņš turpināja savu ceļu un gāja divas/divi stundas. Visā šai laikā viņš satika (redzēja) tikai divus/divi cilvēkus.

11. Mežsargs atrada *(pacēla**) sadegušās lupatas un domājās atradis nesena ugunsgrēka cēloni.

* if he had been out looking for the cause;

** if casually out walking.

12. "Ko esmu izdarījis?" viņš izsaucās, ~~ka~~ redzēja ka grīdu klāja uguns.

13. Viņš pasniedza (iedeva) katram bērnam grāmatu; viņš mēdza saņemt jaunu grāmatu katrā dzimšanas dienā.

14. Jānim nekad neizdevās noskaidrot, kas bij atstājis vēstuli; bija skaidrs, ka tā nebija nākusi pa pastu.

15. "Ir sācies!" ļaudis sauca, kad zeme sāka drebēt (trīcēt).

16. Viņi atstāja kino reizi, kur izradīja jaunāko (pēdējo) franču filmu.

17. Skolotājs runāja pusstundu par pēdējiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam viņš izskaidroja dažas grūtākās vietas iepriekšējā uzdevumā.

18. Viņiem strupī lika iet prom un priecāties (if children - notalāties) kaut kur (can be omitted) citur.

19. Pēkšņi viņa ienāca istabā.

20. Vai tu atgriezies (or nāci) mājās katru nedēļu?
21. Es papēmu laikrastu no plaukta un atvēru to vidū.
22. Durvis aizvērās, un viņa dzirdēja kādu nākam augšā (... viņa dzirdēja, ka kāds nāca augšā).
23. Veikala durvis virinājās nepārtraukti.
24. Viņš skrēja uz vertiem, lai viņus ielaistu.
25. Viņš skraidīja šurp un turp, un darīja te šo te to.
26. Lielāko tiesu savas dzīves viņš bij pavadījis ārzemēs.
Piecdesmit gadu vecumā viņš pēkšpi nolēma atgriezties mājās.
27. Viņš vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem, kad viņš bij prom (no mājās).
28. Viņš iemeta pagales uguni, kas drīz iedegās gaišāki. Tad laiku pa laikam viņš iemeta pa pagalei, lai uzturētu uguni.
29. Lietus apstājās, un abi brāļi izgāja uz (ciema) ielas.
Viņi parasti izgāja šai laikā.
30. Viņš uz acumirkli ieraudzīja viņu pie vielciena lagā.

La 2.

1. Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apciemotu draugus.
2. Saimnieks regulāri brauca uz tirgu: tur viņš iepirka kas viņam (pašam) bij vajadzīgs un pārdeva savus ražojumus. Reizi gadā viņš pārdeva bulli.
3. Tikai dažī atnāca uz sapulci/ ieradās sapulcē (OR iter: mēdza ierasties..), kaut gan daudzi ielūgumi bija/tika issūtīti.
4. Zeme bij sniega klāta. (Sniega klāja zeme) Vietumis (dažur, dažviet, šur-tur) tas bija tik dziļš, ka tikai ar traktoru varēja tikt cauri.
5. "Kas noticis?" viņš jautāja (vaicāja). "Neviens nezina (a)", atbildēja klāststāvošie (acu liecinieki).
6. Tika ticami apgalvots (No ticamiem avotiem ziņots), ka katastrofā cietušās (nokritušās, sarītušās) lidmašīnas apkalpe bij izdzīvojusi (pārdzīvojusi katastrofu).
7. Mēs dzirdējam, ka viņš atgriezās ceturtdienā.
8. Viņš sāka runāt, bet pēc minūtēm piecām (pēc pirmām piecām minūtēm; better: jau pašā sākumā, pēc minūtēm piecām) viņu trauktin pārtrauca (notrūkus traucēja).

9. Klusumu šķēla šāviens (šāviens pārtrauca klusumu). Acimredzami kāds šāva uz vilku.

10. Viņš turpināja (atjaunoja) savu ceļu soļodams stundas divas. Pa visu šo laiku viņš redzēja tikai divus cilvēkus.

11. Mežsargs pacēla apdegušās lupatas un bija pārliecībā (noticeja)*, ka viņš atradis nesenā ugunsgrēka cēloni.

*If he subsequently changed his opinion, if another cause came forward.

12. "Ko es esmu nodarījis (padarījis, pastrādājis), viņš iesaucās ieraudādam, ka visa grīda pārklāta ar ūdeni (visa istaba ūdenī, ūdens plūst pa visu grīdu).

13. Viņš pasniedza grāmatu katram no bērniem: katrā dzimšanas diena (not so fashionable - dzimundienā) viņi mēdza sapemt pa jaunai grāmatai.

× 14. Jānis (Džons) nekad nespēja atklāt, kas bij atstājis (to) vēstuli - acimredzami tā nebij nākusi pa pastu.

15. "Sācies", ļaudis kļiedza, kad zeme sāka tricēt.

16. Viņi kopā iznāca no kino(-teatra), kur tika rādīta jaunākā franču filma.

17. Skolotajs runāja (stāstīja) pusstundu par pēdējiem (jaunākiem) sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā un tad viņš izskaidroja dažas grūtības, kas bij atgadījušās pēdējā rakstdarbā.
18. Viņiem strupī tika pateikts doties (idiom:) lasīties (unidiom. :) skriet prom un netaļāties (spēlēties) kaut kur citur.
19. Viņa pēkšņi (negraidīti) ienāca istabā.
20. "Vai jūs mēdžāt atgriezties mājās (nākt, braukt) katru nedēļu?"
21. Es papēmu avīzi no plaukta un to attaisīju vidējā lappusē.
22. Durvis aizcirtās un viņa dzirdēja kādu nākam (pa trepēm) uz augšu.
23. Veikala durvis tika virinātas nepārtraukti.
24. Mēs skrējām lejā uz vārtiem lai viņus (tos) ielaistu iekšā.
25. Viņš skraidīja krustām šķērsām nododamies te ar šo, te ar to.
26. Viņš savas dzīves lielāko tiesu bij pavadījis ārzemēs.
Piecdesmit gadu vecumā viņš pēkšņi nolēma atgriezties mājās.
27. Viņš vienmēr mēdza rakstīt vecākiem kad bija (atradās) prom no mājā.

28. Vīpš uzmeta pagales (if outside the house: uz ugunskura, if inside: kamina, neutrally: virsū) un uguns drīz dega daudz košāk. Tad laiku pa laikam vīpš piemeta pa pagalei.
29. Lietus apstājās un abi brāļi izgāja ārā sādžas ielā (ielipā) Vīpi parasti mēdza iziet ap šoo(dienas) laiku.
30. Vīpš uz vietas vīpu ieraudzīja kad vilciens apstājās.

La 3.

1. Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apciemotu draugus.
2. Fermeris regulāri brauca uz tirgu; tur viņš pirka visu vajadzīgo un pārdeva savus produktus. Reizi gadā viņš pārdeva bulli.
3. Uz sanākumiem ieradās nedaudzi; lai gan daudzi ielūgami bija izsūtīti.
4. Ārā zeme bija pārklāta ar sniegu. Vietām tas bija tik dziļš, ka tikai traktors varēja iekļūt cauri.
5. "Kas ir noticis?" viņš jautāja. "Neviens nezina," atbildēja klātesošie.
6. Ir drošas ziņas ka avariju cietušās lidmašīnas visa apkalpe ir palikusi dzīva.
7. Mēs dzirdējam, ka viņš ceturtdien atgriezies.
8. Viņš sāka runāt, taču pēc pirmajām piecām minūtēm* viņš tika pastāvīgi pārtraukts.
9. Klusumu pārtrauca šāviens. Kāds, bez šaubām, bija šāvis uz vilku.

* Most spell minute with a short -u-.

10. Viņš turpināja savu ceļu un gāja divas stundas. Pa visu šo laiku viņš redzēja tikai divus cilvēkus.
11. Mežsargs pacēla apdegušās akrandas un noticeja, ka viņš atradis nesen notikušā ugunsgrēka cēloni.
12. "Ko es esmu izdarījis?" viņš iesaucās, kad viņš redzēja, ka visa grīda pārplūdusi ar ūdeni.
13. Viņš pasniedza grāmatu katram bērnam; katrā dzimšanas dienā viņi mēdza saņemt jaunu grāmatu.
14. Džons nekad nevarēja uzzināt, kas bija atstājis vēstuli, - acīm redzot, tā nebija pienākusi pa pastu.
15. "Sākās" kļiedsa cilvēki, kad zeme sāka tricēt.
16. Viņi kopā iznāca no kinoteātra, kurā demonstrēja jaunāko franču filmu.
17. Skolotājs pusstundu runāja par jaunākajiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam viņš paskaidroja vienu vai divus sarežģītus jautājumus, kuri bija radušies pēdējā vingrinājumā.
18. Viņiem tika skarbi pateikts skriet projām un uzjautrināties kaut kur citur.
19. Pēkšņi viņa ienāca istabā.

20. "Vai jūs pārbraucat mājās katru nedēļu?"
21. Es paņēmu avīzi no plaukta un atvēru to vidējā lappusē.
22. Durvis aizvērās, un viņa dzirdēja kādu nākam augšup pa kāpnēm.
23. Veikala durvis pastāvīgi atvērās un aizvērās.
24. Viņš skraidīja uz priekšu un atpakaļ, nodarbinādams sevi ar šo un to.
26. Savas dzīves lielāko daļu viņš bija parādījis ārzemēs.
Piecdesmit gadu vecumā viņš pēkšņi nolēma doties uz mājām.
27. Viņš vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem, kad viņš bija projām no mājām.
28. Viņš svieda pagales kamīnā, kas drīz vien dega ar spožāku liesmu. Tad laiku pa laikam viņš mēdza iesveist vēl vienu pagali, lai uguns nenodristu.
29. Lietus pārstāja līt, un abi brāļi izgāja uz ciemata ielas.
Viņi parasti gāja ārā ap šo laiku.
30. Viņš tobrīd ieraudzīja viņu pie vielciens loga.

La 4.

1. Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu apciemot draugus.
2. Lauksaimnieks brauca uz tirgu regulāri; tur viņš pirka ko viņam vajadzēja un pārdeva savus ražojumus. Reizi gadā viņš pārdeva bulļi.
3. Maz atnāca uz sanāksmi kaut gan daudz ielūgumu bija izsūtīti.
4. Zeme ārā bija apklāta ar sniegu. Vietām tas bija tik dziļš, ka tikai traktors varēja tikt cauri.
5. "Kas ir noticis?" viņš jautāja. "Neviens nezina", atbildēja klātesošie.
6. Tika ticami ziņots, ka visa nogāzušās lidmašīnas apkalpe izglābād.
7. Mes dzirdējām, ka viņš atnāca atpakaļ ceturtdienā.
8. Viņš sāka runāt, bet pēc pirmām piecām minūtēm viņš tika pastāvīgi pārtraukts.
9. Klusums tika pārtraukts no šāviens. Kāds bija, bez šaubām, šāvis uz vilku.
10. Viņš turpināja savu ceļu un gāja divas stundas. Visa šai laikā viņš redzēja tikai divus cilvēkus.

11. Medību pārzinis pacēla apdegušāslupatas un domāja ka viņš ir atradis oļoni nesenam ugunsgrēkam.
12. "Ko es esmu izdarījis?" viņš izsaucās, kad viņš redzēja visu grīdu apklātu ar ūdeni.
13. Viņš pasniedza katram bērnam grāmatu; katrā dzimšanas dienā viņi mēdza saņemt jaunu grāmatu.
14. Jānis nekad nespēja atklāt kurš bija atstājis vēstuli, tā acīm redzot nebija nākusi pa pastu.
15. "Ir sācies", ļaudis sauca, kad zeme sāka trīcēt.
16. Viņi kopā nāca ārā no kino, kas bija rādījis pēdējo franču filmu.
17. Skolotājs runāja pusstundu par pēdējiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; viņš tad izskaidroja dažas grūtības, kas bija parādījušās pēdējā uzdevumā.
18. Viņiem tika strupī pateikts lei iet projām un uzjautrinās kādā citā vietā.
19. Pēkšpi viņa ienāca istabā.
20. "Vai Jūs nācāt mājās katru nedēļu?"

21. Es paņēmu laikrakstu no plaukta un atvēru to vidējā lapas pusē.
22. Durvis aizvērās in vīpa dzirdēja kādu nākam pa trepēm uz augšu.
23. Veikala durvis pastāvīgi atvērās un aizvērās.
24. Vīpš skrēja lejā pie vārtiem lai vīpus ielaistu iekšā.
25. Vīpš skraidīja šurp un turp, nodarbinādams sevi gan ar šo ar to.
26. Vīpš bija pavadījis savas dzīves lielāko daļu ārzemēs. Piecdesmit gadu vecumā vīpš pēkšņi nolēma nakt mājās.
27. Vīpš vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem, kad vīpš bija projām no mājām.
28. Vīpš meta malkas pagales ugunī, kas drīz dega daudz gaišāki. Tad laiku pa laikam vīpš metas citas pagales, lai uguns neizdziest.
29. Lietus apstājās un abi brāļi izgāja ārā uz ciema ielas. Vīpi parasti gāja ārā ap šo laiku.
30. Vīpš pamanija vīpu momentāli pie vilciena loga.

La 5.

1. Katru gadu viņi mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apciemotu draugus.
2. Zemnieks allaž brauca uz tirgu; tur viņš pirka, ko vajadzēja, un pārdeva savus ražojumus. Katru gadu (Ikgadus) viņš pārdeva pa vienam bullim.
3. Tikai nedaudzi atnāca uz sapulci, kaut gan daudzi tika aicināti.
4. Āra viss bija apsnidzis. Vietām sniegs bija tik dziļš, ka tikai ar traktoru varēja izbraukt cauri.
5. "Kas ir noticis?" viņš jautāja. "Neviens nezina", atbildēja klātesošie.
6. No drošiem avotiem ziņo, ka visa lidmašīnas apkalpe, kas avarēja, izglābās.
7. Mēs dzirdējam, ka viņš atgriezās octurtdien.
8. Viņš sāka runāt, bet jau pēc piecām minūtēm viņu pastāvīgi pārtrauca.
9. Sāviens pārtrauca klusumu; nebija šaubu, ka kāds šāva vilku.
10. Viņš turpināja ceļu un nogāja divas stundas. Pa visu šo laiku viņš redzēja tikai divus cilvēkus.

11. Mežsargs pacēla apdegušās lupatas un bija parliecināts, ka atrada ugunsgrēka cēloni.
12. "Ko es izdarīju", viņš izsaucās, kad ieraudzīja, ka visa grīda bija appludināta.
13. Katram bērnam viņš iedeva pa grāmatai; katru (ik) dzimšanas dienu viņi sapēma jaunu grāmatu.
14. Jānim neizdevās uzzināt, kas atstāja vēstuli - bija skaidrs, ka tā (viņa) neatnāca pa pastu.
15. "Nu, jau sākās", kļiedza ļaudis, kad zeme sāka drebēt.
16. Viņi kopā iznāca no kinozāles, kurā rādīja jaunāko franču filmu.
17. Skolotāja runāja (stāstīja) pusstundu par jaunākiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam oipš izskaidroja dažas neskaidrības pēdējā vingrinājumā.
18. Pēkšņi viņiem lika lasīties prom un spēlēties kur citur.
19. Negaidīti viņa ienāca istabā.
20. "Vai jūs katru nedēļu nākat mājās?"
21. Es papēmu no plaukta avīzi un atvēru vidējo lapu.

22. Durvis aizvērās, un viņš dzirdēja, ka kāds nāca (kāpa) augšā (pa trepēm).
23. Veikala durvis visu laiku vērās ciet un vaļā.
24. Viņš aizskrēja līdz vārtiem un ielaida viņus iekšā.
25. Viņš skrēja ārpus un turp, darīdams gan šo, gan to.
26. Sava mūža lielāko daļu viņš pavadīja ārsmēs. Piecdesmit gadu vecumā, viņš piepeši lēma atgriezties mājās.
27. Prombūtnē no mājām, viņš vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem.
28. Viņš iemeta pagales uguni, kas drīzi vien sāka degt ar gaišāku liesmu. Pēc tam viņš pa laikam piemeta pa pagalei, lai uguns neapdzistu.
29. Lietus pārgāja un abi brāļi izgāja ārā ciema ielās. Viņi parasti izgāja ārā ap šo laiku.
30. Viņš pēkšņi ieraudzīja viņu vilciena logā,

B 7.

1. Vsaka godina te pätuvaha v Evropa na gosti na prijatelite.
2. Farmerät redovno hodeše s kolata si na pazar, tam kupuvažē kakvoto mu ē mužno i prodavašē kakvoto bešē proizvel. Vednaž v godinata prodavašē bik.
3. Văpreki če bjaha izpratēni mnogo pokani, malko hora dojdoha na săbranieto.
4. Navăn zemjata be pokrita săs snjag. Njakăde snegăt tolkova dălbok, če možešē da se mine samo s traktor.
5. Kakvo se ē slučilo? popita toj. Nikoj ne znaš, otgovoriha horata, koite stoeha naokolo.
6. Bešē săobštēno săs sigurnost, če celijat ekipaž na katastrofiralija samolet bešē oživljaj.
7. Čuhme, če se ē vărnał v četvărtăk.
8. Toj započna da govori, po sled părvite 5 minuti postojanno go prekăsvaha.
9. Tišinata be narušēna ot grăm (izstrel). Nesămnēno njakoj streljašē po vălk.
10. Toj prodăłži pătja si i vărvoja 2 ōasa. Prez ōjaloto vreme vidja samo dvama duši.

11. Podarjat vze izgoreštite parštali i misleše če e odkril
priznatinata za neotdavnashnija požar.
12. "Kakvo napravih", vžklikna toj kato vidja, če celijat pod
e pokrit s voda.
13. Toj podade kniga na vsjako dete - po sveki rožden den, to
polučavaha nova kniga.
14. Džon nikoga ne moža da razbere koj e (be) ostavil pismoto -
očevično tome be došlo s poštata.
15. "Započna," vikaha horata, kogato zemjata započna treperja.
16. Te izljazoha zasedno ot kinoto, kădeto davaha naj-novijsa
frenski film.
17. Učiteljat govori polovin čas za naj-novite postiženija v
tehnikata, posle objasni ednadve ot trudnite mesta, sreštnati
v poslednoto upražnenie.
18. Rjazko im kazaha da se malat i da se zabavljavat njakăde
drugade.
19. Izvednaž tha vleze v stajata.
20. Vraštahte li se vkăšti vsjaka sednica?

21. Vseh vestnika ot rafta i go otvorih na stranicata v sredata.
22. Vratata se zatvori i tja ōu, ōe njakoj idva gore.
23. Vratata na magazina neprekāsnato se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše.
24. Toj iztiča dolu do portata da im otvori.
25. Toj tičaše nasam-natam, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova.
26. Beše prekaral po-goljamata ōast ot Źivota si v ōuŹbina. Kogato be na 50 godini, vnezapno reši da se vārne v rodinata si.
27. Vinagi pišeše na roditelite si, kogato beše daleč ot kāšti.
28. Toj hvārli dārva v ogānja, kojto skoro se razgorja jarko.
Posle otvreme-navreme toj hvārljaše po njakoe dārvo da go poddārŹa.
29. Dēdčāt sprja i dvamata bratja izljazoha na selskata ulica.
Obiknovenno izlizaha po tova vreme.
30. Toj ja vidja za moment ot prozoreca na vlaka.

B 2.

1. Vsaka godina te obiknovenno pätuvaha v Evropa na gosti na svoi prijateli.
2. Fermerät hodeše na pazar redovno; tam toj kupuvaže, tova kosto mu beše nužno i prodavaše stokata si. Edin päť v godinata toj prodavaše po edin bik.
3. Malko hora dojdoha na sreštata, väpreki, že bjaha razprateni mnogo pokani.
4. Navän zemjata beše pokrita säs snjag. Na mesta toj beše tolkova älibok, že same traktor možeše da mine.
5. "Kakvo se služe?" popita toj. Nikoj ne znae - odgovorihä stojäštite.
6. Beše säobštene dostoverno, že ekipažät na samoleta kojto katastrofira e oživljäl.
7. Čuhme, že se värna v četvärtäk.
8. Toj započna da govori, no sled pet minuti toj beše postojanno prekäsvan.
9. Tišinata beše prekäsната ot izstrel. Bezsämneno, njakoj beše streljal po välk.

10. Toj prodālži pātja si i vārvja dva časa. Prez cjaloto tova vreme vidja samo dvama duši.
11. Gorskijat vđigna izgorenite dripi i pomisli, če e odkril pričinata za požara.
12. Toj razdađe po edna kniga na vsjako dete; za vseki rožden den te obiknovenno polučavaha po edna nova kniga.
13. "Kakvo napravih" - vāzklikna toj, kogato vidja, če celijat pod beše pokrit s voda.
14. Džon nikoga ne moža da odkrie koj beše ostavil pismoto - javno beše, če to ne beše došlo po poštata.
15. "Započna - zakreštjaka horata, kogato zemjata započna da se trese.
16. Te izljazoha zaidno ot kinoto, v koeto davaha naj-novija frenski film.
17. Učiteljat govori polovin čas za naj-novite postiženija v tehnologijata. Posle toj objasni edna-dve ot trudnostite, sreštnati v poslednoto upražnenija.
18. Napravo im beše kazano da zapusnat i se zabavljavat drugade.
19. Izvednāk tja vleze vstajata.

20. "Vsajaka sedmica li se vráštaše v kášti.
21. Az vzeh vestnika ot policata i go otvorih na srednata stranica.
22. Vratata na magazina se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše postojanno.
24. Toj iztiča do portata da im otvori.
25. Toj tičaše nasam-natam, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova.
26. Toj beše prekaral po goljamata čast ot života si v čužbina. Na petdesetgodisna vāzrast toj izvednāš reši da se vārne v rodinata se.
27. Toj vinagi pišeše na roditelite se, kogato ne beše v kášti.
28. Toj hvārli sāčkite v ogānja, kojto skoro se rezpali. Posle ot vreme na vreme hvārlijaše po njakvoja druga sāčka, za da poddārēja ogānja.
29. Dāždāt sprja, i dvamata bratja izljazoha na selskata ulička. Te obiknovenno izlizaha po tova vreme.
30. Toj ja zārnja za mig na prozoreca na vlaka.

Appendix C

Notes on alphabets and transliteration systems.

1. Roman

The standard orthography of those languages which use Roman is used with modifications in a few places.

2. Lithuanian

/ė/ - é;

Nasalisation is indicated by a subscript comma.

Latvian

Palatalisation as in standard orthography indicated by comma, superscript comma replaced by acute accent.

Serbo-Croatian

Croatian orthography used without modification.

Polish

Nasalisation indicated by subscript comma.

Turkish

Back variant of /i/ - ı

2. Transliteration from Cyrillic

With certain modification is based on transliteration of OCS.

OCS

Front and back jers - *i* and *ū*.

Russian

а	а	р	г
б	б	с	с
в	в	т	т
г	г	у	у
д	д	ф	ф
е, ё	е	х	х
ж	ж	ц	ц
з	з	ч	ч
и	и	ш	ш
й	й	щ	щ
к	к	ъ	"
л	л	ы	у
м	м	ь	'
н	н	э	е
о	о	ю	ju
п	п	я	ja

Bulgarian

Ѣ (here a reduced vowel) - *ĕ*.

Macedonian

ќ, ѓ rendered as in Cyrillic with acute, i.e. *k'*, *g'*.

Bibliography

I. General:

1. Howard I. Aronson, Bulgarian Inflectional Morpho-
phonology, Mouton, The Hague-
Paris, 1968.
2. Leonardas Dambriūnas, Verbal Aspects in Lithuanian,
Lingua Posnanensis, PWN, Poznan,
1959 [LP7]
3. Jānis Endzelins, Latviešu Valodas Gramatika,
Riga, 1951
4. Marija Gimbutas, The Balts, Thames and Hudson,
London 1971.
5. Marija Gimbutas. The Slavs, Thames and Hudson,
London 1971.
6. Erich Hofmann, Ausdrucksverstärkung, Zeitschrift
für Vergleichende Sprachforschung,
Ergänzungshefte, 7 - 10, Vandenhoeck
& Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1930.
7. Petras Jonikas, Lietuvių Kalbos Istorija, Terra
Chicago, 1952.

8. Jerzy Kurylowicz, Réflexions sur l'Imparfait et les Aspects en V. Slave., International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, I & II.

9. Horace G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar, Mouton and Co. 's-Gravenhage, 1966. [HGL(0)]

10. -- " -- Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language., Državno Knigoizdatelstvo na NR Makedonija, Skopje, 1952. [HGL]

11. John Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics., Cambridge at the University Press, 1968. [JL].

12. Arthur A. MacDonell, A Sanskrit Grammar for Students, Third Edition, OUP, 1955

13. Thomas F. Magner and William R. Schmalstieg, Baltic Linguistics, The Pennsylvania State University Press., 1970.

14. Ju S. Maslov. Morfologija Glagol'nogo Vida V Sovremennom Bolgarskom Literaturnom Jazyke, AN, SSSR, M & L, 1963.

15. Yusuf Mardin, Colloquial Turkish, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1966.

16. W. K. Matthews, Russian Historical Grammar, University of London, The Athlone Press, 1960.
17. Grigore Nandriș, Old Church Slavonic Grammar, University of London, The Athlone Press, 1965.
18. A. P. Nepokupny, Areal'nye Aspekty Balto-Slavjanskikh Jazykovyh Otnoŝenij, AN Ukr S.S.R., Kiev, 1964.
19. Alfred Senn, Zum Gebrauch der Aktionsarten im Litauischen, Studi Baltici, vol III, Roma - Istituto per l'Europa Orientale, MCMZZZIII - 1933.
20. Jan Otrębski, Gramatyka Języka Litewskiego, 3 Vols, PWN, Warsaw, 1958.
21. V. Staltmane, Verbu Veidi Mūsdienu Latviešu Literarajā Valodā, Valodas un literatūras Inst. Raksti, VII Riga, [VS].
22. Christian Stang, Das Slavische und Baltische Verbum, Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, [Hist], Filos. Klasse, II, 1942, No 1, [ChSt]

23. Valentin Stankov, Imperfekti v sāvremenija Bālgarski knižoven Ezik, Izdatelstvo na Bālgarskata Akadēmija na Naukite, Sofia, 1966.

24. V. N. Toporov, O Nekotoryh Arhaizmah v Sisteme Baltijskogo glagola, Int. Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, Vol V 1962.

II. Dictionaries:

25. Bālgarsko-Anglijaski Rečnik, Dāržavno izdatelstvo "Nauka i Angliški Izkustvo, Sofia, 1961.
26. E. Turkina, Latviešu Angļu Vārdnīca, Imanta, Copenhagen, 1964. [LAVTur]
27. K. Mühlenbach, Latviešu Valodas Vārdnīca, (Latvian-German), Latvian Ministry of Education, Riga, 1923. [KM]
28. Vilius Pėteraitis, Lietuviškai-Angliškas Žodynas, II laida, LKK, Chicago, 1960. [LAZ/60].
29. A. Lyberis, Lietuvių Rusų Kalbų Žodynas, Valstybinė Politinės ir Mokslinės Literatūros Leidykla, Vilnius, 1962.

30. Makedonsko-Russkij
Slovar' Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo
inostrannyh nacional'nyh slovaroj,
Moscow, 1963.
31. Jan Stanisławski, The Great English-Polish Dictionary,
PWWP, Warsaw, 1966 [GEFD].
32. Rusu-Lietuvių Kalbų Žodynas, Leidykla "Mintis", 2 vols,
Vilnius.
33. T. Budipa Lazdina, Teach Yourself Latvian, EUP, London, 1966.
[TYL]
- III. Artistic Literature:
34. Rudolfs Blaumanis, Dancis pa Trim, Novelu Izlase
(selected short stories), J.
Kadīļa Apgāds, 1947. [DP3].
35. Isaak Babel', Konarmija i Odesskie Rasskazy,
Bradda Books, Letchworth, Hertfordshire,
1966.
36. Petras Cvirka, Zemē Maitintoja, Vilnius, 1956
[PCZM].
37. Jānis Jaunsudrabiņš, Baltā Grāmata, Ed. Alaipa Izdevums,
[JJBGr]
38. K. Marx & F. Engels, The Communist Manifesto, Progress
Publishers, Moscow. [CME]

39. ---"--- Manifest na Komunistiškata
 Partija, Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata
 Komunistiĉeska Partija, Sofia,
 1963, [CMB].
40. ---"--- Komunistų Partijos Manifestas,
 Valstybinė Politinės ir Mokslinės
 Literatūros Leidykla, Vilnius
 1961 [CML].
41. Juozas Baltušis Paskutinis Tylus Džiaugsmas, [PTDz],
 Tiesių Kelių nėra. [TKN],
 (from the selection of short stories)
 Valiusei Reikia Alekso, Vilnius, 1965.
42. A. Leskien, Litauisches Lesebuch, Carl Winter's
 Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg,
 1919, [ALLL].
43. Džorĉis Orvels, Dzīwnieku Farma, Latpress Apgāds,
 London, 1954, (translated from
 English original by V. Skultans)
 [DzF].
44. George Orwell, Animal Farm, Penguin Books 1954,
 [AF].
45. M. Solohov, Sādbata na Čoveka, Voenno Izdatelstvo,
 Sofia, 1965, [SMC]

46. M Solohov, Sud'ba Celoveka, Collet's (Publishers)
Ltd., London 1964.

III.2 Journals and Newspapers:

47. Liesma, March 1969, Riga [LIE]
48. -- " -- April 1969, Riga.
49. Nova Makedonija, 1 November, 1964, Skopje.

IV. Books and Journal cited by V. Staltmane, op cit p 47. Here
are mentioned only such as appear in the text.

50. Arvīds Grigulis, Lepina ielā deg spuldze, R. 1953.
[AGkLie].
51. Anna Sakse, Pret kalnu, T., 1950. [ASPk]
52. Andrejs Upītis, Kopoti raksti, XII, R, 1952, [AUP1m]
53. Cīņa, Nr 69, Riga 1955.
54. E. Birznieks-Upītis, Izlase. R, 1954. [EBuIz1]
55. E. Birznieks-Upītis, Stāsti, R., 1954. [EBuSt]
56. Jānis Jaunsudrabiņš, Balta Grāmata, R., 1935 [JJBGr]

57. Padomju Latvijas Skola, 1955, 6, Riga. [PLSk].
58. Rudolfs Blaumanis, Lugu Izlase, R., 1946. [RBILi].
59. Rudolfs Blaumanis, Noveles, R., 1950. [RBINov].

Letters in square brackets refer to abbreviations appearing in text.